The Mennonite Quarterly Review

VOLUME XXV JULY 1951 NUMBER THREE

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL 146

THE BERNESE ANABAPTISTS IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY 147
Delbert Gratz

THE MENNONITE COMMONWEALTH IN RUSSIA, 1789-1914 173
A Sociological Interpretation
E. K. Francis

THE MENNONITE CHURCH IN WORLD WAR II 183
A Review and Evaluation
Melvin Gingerich

MICHAEL SATTLER'S TRIAL AND MARTYRDOM IN 1527 201
Gustav Bossert, Jr.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL AND RESEARCH NOTES

EBERHARD ARNOLD, 1883-1939—A SHORT BIOGRAPHY 219
E. C. H. Arnold

TWO LETTERS OF 1889 FROM THE J. F. FUNK COLLECTION 222
I. U.S. SECRETARY OF STATE JAMES G. BLAINE TO JOHN F. FUNK
II. N. B. GRUBB TO JOHN F. FUNK

BOOK REVIEWS

Culbert G. Rutenber, *The Dagger and the Cross* 224
Reviewed by Erland Waltner

J. Winfield Fretz, *Christian Mutual Aid: A Handbook of Brotherhood Economics* 225
Reviewed by Guy F. Hershberger

John A. Hostetler, *Annotated Bibliography on the Amish, An Annotated Bibliography of Source Materials Pertaining to the Old Order Amish Mennonites* 226
Reviewed by Melvin Gingerich

Mennonite Cyclopedic Dictionary. Daniel Kauffman, editor 227
Reviewed by Harold S. Bender

L. J. Burkholder, *A Brief History of the Mennonites in Ontario* 228
Reviewed by Harold S. Bender

J. S. Hartzler, *Mennonites in the World War or Nonresistance Under Test* 229
Reviewed by Guy F. Hershberger

Hermann Rüegger, *Aufzeichnungen über Entstehung und Bekenntnis Gemeinschaft Evangelisch Taufgesinnter* 230
Reviewed by Delbert Gratz

J. D. Graber, *We Enter China* 231
J. D. Graber, *We Enter Japan*
Reviewed by Melvin Gingerich

EDITORIAL

The Bernese Anabaptists of the 16th Century are the ancestors of practically all the present day Swiss Mennonites, and of the largest portion of the French, South German and Eastern United States Mennonites. The Emmenthal district of the Canton of Bern is the only place where there has been continuous residence from the beginning of any Anabaptist-Mennonites, except Emden (Ostfriesland in Northwest Germany) and certain places in Holland. The Review is happy to present in this issue the first of three chapters from a recently completed doctoral dissertation at the University of Bern, Switzerland, by Delbert Gratz, soon to be published in book form, which gives the full history of this central Anabaptist group in Switzerland and an account of its 19th Century daughter settlements in America. This is the first adequate publication in English of a scholarly treatment of the Bernese Anabaptists based on the original sources, some of which are here used for the first time. The first article on the 16th century will be followed by those on the 17th and 18th centuries.

A true understanding of the Mennonites in ANY time or place is impossible without both a theological and a sociological interpretation. Particularly is this so in the case of the history of the Mennonites in Russia which has been brought to a tragic close by the systematic destruction of their colonies by the present Communistic regime. Yet both the theological and sociological analogies and interpretations have been largely neglected. It has remained for a Catholic sociologist, Professor E. K. Francis, formerly of Austria and Germany, but now a professor in the University of Notre Dame, to make the first substantial contribution to this sociological analysis. He does this in a sense through the back door, since his major research has been on the Mennonites in Manitoba in an outstanding book entitled *In Search of Utopia,* which is to be published soon by the University of Toronto press. However, since the Mennonites of Manitoba merely transplanted to the prairie land of Manitoba in 1874 a religio-social system already fully developed in South Russia, a sociological analysis of this Russian system was a prerequisite to a study of the Manitoba community. This analysis, a masterpiece of insight, clarity, objectivity, and scientific accuracy, particularly notable in that the author never observed the Mennonites in Russia at first hand and is of a radically different religious persuasion, is set forth in compact form in the article "The Mennonite Commonwealth in Russia 1789-1914," which is a section of the first chapter of the book. Its methodology apart from its conclusions will be most helpful to others working in the field, not only of Russian Mennonite history, but in all fields of Mennonite history. The editors are grateful to the Historical and Scientific Society of Manitoba for the permission for advance publication, and look forward with much expectation to the appearance of the full volume. It should be as epoch-making in its field as Prof. Ernst Correll's sociological study of the Swiss-Palatinate Mennonites twenty-five years ago (*Das schweizerische Täufermennonitentum Ein soziologischer Bericht,* Tubingen, 1925).

World War II (1940-45) was a major test of the Mennonite Church, particularly in its nonresistant principles, but also in its general life and organization. While it may be too soon to give a final report on this test, the evaluation given by Melvin Gingerich in his article "The Mennonite Church in World War II: A Review and Evaluation" will we believe be rated as generally sound and acceptable by those who are most familiar with the history of this period. Particularly well-equipped for the task by his thorough history of Mennonite Civilian Public Service (*Service for Peace,* 1949), the author ploughs a straight furrow, with a treatment that is both objective and honest as well as understanding.

One of the most appealing figures of the early Swiss Brethren movement is Michael Sattler. His martyrdom in May, 1527, at Rottenburg, not far from Stuttgart, made a powerful impression upon his contemporaries, and its story has become one of the classics of Anabaptist literature. Commissioned by the editors of the *Mennonitisches Lexikon,* Gustav Bossert, Jr. prepared a thorough study of the trial and martyrdom in an article which is ultimately to appear in that publication, but which is here presented in translation, the first substantial publication in English on Michael Sattler.

In the absence of a bibliographical report, we present in the section, "Bibliographical and Research Notes," a short biographical article on the late founder of revived modern Hutterianism, Eberhard Arnold, and two interesting letters from the John F. Funk collection.

The Mennonite Quarterly Review

VOLUME XXV JULY 1951 NUMBER THREE

THE BERNESE ANABAPTISTS IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY

DELBERT GRATZ

Origin of the Bernese Anabaptists[1]

The exact origins of the Anabaptists in the old Bernese state[2] are not clear. Nor is it likely that the entire story ever shall be known. Various theories have been put forth but documentary proof is nonexistent. During the years 1524 to 1529 one finds manuscripts verifying the existence of Anabaptist groups in most of the lands of the German tongue. They reached from Hesse to Switzerland, and from Alsace to Silesia.

[1] The term "Anabaptist" is used in this study as a translation of the terms *Täufer* and *Wiedertäufer*. The designation *Brüder* was the only name used by the Anabaptists in reference to themselves for many years after their inception. Finally they halfheartedly adopted the names originally given them by their enemies, preferring later the term *Taufgesinnte*. The group that remained in Switzerland officially adopted the name *Altevangelische Taufgesinnten-Gemeinde der Schweiz* in 1894. Today they are commonly known as *Alttäufer* to differentiate them from the *Neutäufer* (*Gemeinschaft der Taufgesinnten*), a group that broke away from the original body in 1832. Those going to Germany soon adopted the name *Mennoniten*. In America the name *Swiss Mennonite* is usually given to the groups that have settled there during the nineteenth century.

[2] For many years Bern was organized as a city-state. The government was most commonly called the *Stadt Bern*. During the seventeenth century and afterward it was also referred to as *Republic Bern*. It was also called the *Stand Bern* (State of Bern) in certain circumstances. The use of the term *canton* in connection with the Bernese government does not appear until the middle of the eighteenth century, and was not in common use until after the beginning of the nineteenth century. In this study the term *state* will be used. For all practical purposes Bern (like the other states in the Swiss Confederacy) had a sovereign government. The *Tagsatzung* (federal parliament of the Swiss Confederacy) had little power to legislate and practically no executive power.

Two theories have been foremost in explaining the beginnings of the Bernese Anabaptists. They are (1) that the Anabaptists arose from the Waldensian movement which had been in Bernese territory since the thirteenth century, and (2) that the movement was carried to Bern from Zurich.

Theory of Waldensian Descent

In the year 1277 heretics were found in Schwarzenburg.[3] The Bishop of Lausanne ordered the Dominicans, the heretic judges of the time, to seek them out. Brother Humbert, the Dominican convent preacher in Bern, had them burned at Bern. About 100 years later it is reported that a heretic named Löffler from Bremgarten was brought to Bern, tried, and burned. In 1399 over 130 Waldenses were found in Bernese territory. They were both men and women, rich and poor and persons of high esteem. Through the persuasion of Brother Hans von Landau, a Dominican, and other learned men, the Waldensians took an oath renouncing their heretical ideas. As it was their first offense they were not burned as was the customary treatment for heretics. Rather, they were fined the immense sum of 3,000 florins ($150,000).[4] During the same year a meeting was held by Bernese and Freiburg authorities at Wünnewil, a village located between the two cities, to decide how to handle the growing number of Waldenses in their lands. A committee of investigation was established with the Dominicans of Lausanne in charge. They started their inquisition on December 3, 1399. The governments of Bern and Freiburg favored a milder policy than the Dominican inquisitors. During this time 53 Waldenses were found. In their hearings they professed various beliefs which included:

(1) non-belief in the power of the church authorities to forgive sin,

(2) giving honor or praying to the saints or Mary is of no avail,

(3) working on Sunday or holy days is no sin,

(4) non-belief in purgatory,

(5) offering prayers or saying mass is of no aid to the dead,

(6) priests or holy men who take offerings are not helping the welfare of the soul,

[3] At that time the Herrschaft Schwarzenburg belonged to Savey. In 1423 it came under the joint rule of the states of Bern and Freiburg. This arrangement of government remained in effect until the French Revolution.

[4] The currencies of the time are translated here into United States dollars. The basis for the comparisons is the cost of staple foods.

(7) holy water does not forgive sins,

(8) penitence by another avails nothing,

(9) when a person dies he may be buried anywhere, not necessarily in a cemetery that has been blessed,

(10) needless use of God's name is a sin of death,

(11) ministers should be at least 34 years of age,

(12) the aim is to keep the same faith regardless of growth in numbers.[5]

These beliefs reflect more closely the spirit of the reformers than the early Anabaptist confessions of faith. While not contrary to Anabaptist doctrine there is a noticeable omission of such cardinal points as nonresistance, non-swearing of oaths, nonconformity to the world, and believers' baptism.

It is easily understandable that there were Waldenses in this region as it lay en route from Italy to Germany where important centers of the Waldensian faith were located.

In 1429 a trial was held in Fribourg at which time the fact was revealed that Schwarzenburg had many Waldenses and that they had connection with their brethren in Solothurn, Germany, and Bohemia.[6]

In 1430 Waldensian ministers came to Fribourg from Germany and Moravia for the purpose of strengthening the Waldensian communities there. This is the last account of Waldenses in the vicinity of Bern.

Innocent VIII included Switzerland in a Papal Bull of April 25, 1487, as a place in which Waldensians should be exterminated.[7]

Let us then examine the facts concerning a possible Waldensian-Anabaptist connection in the Bernese area. First, it is to be noted that there are no records that Waldenses existed in Bernese territory at the time of the Reformation. This does not prove, however, that there were none there at that time. There are periods in Bernese Anabaptist history where the records are silent for a number of years, although we know that the group was still in existence.[8] The Emmental Anabaptists in the middle decades of the eighteenth century are an example of this point. In pre-Reformation times records were kept even more rarely than during the

[5] [Bernhard Rudolf] Fetscherin, Dr., "Beitrag zur Geschichte der Waldenser," *Abhandlungen des Historischen Vereins des Kanton Bern,* II, 2, 335-42. This is a summary, not a verbatim translation.

[6] Ochsenbein, Gottlieb Friederich, *Aus dem Schweizerischen Volksleben des* XV. Jahrhundert (Bern, 1881), 150.

[7] Müller, Ernst, *Geschichte der bernischen Täufer* (Frauenfeld, 1895), 65.

[8] *Ibid.,* 67.

time following the Reformation. Records concerning pre-Reformation Waldenses only exist when an inquisition against them was in progress. This only occurred when a bishop found that such action would be to his praise. But often it was to his benefit not to bring such matters to light. In such a place as the state of Bern the people were never disposed to see their peaceful neighbors punished even though they differed in religious thinking.[9] The very existence of the Anabaptists in the Emmental during certain most difficult times of persecution is due to this fact. One can well imagine that the same took place among the Waldenses although no chronicle or other written indication for or against this idea has been preserved to prove or disprove it.

Second. The Anabaptists' vast knowledge of the Bible was not gained through the preaching of the ministry. They resembled, rather, the traveling Waldensian minister who often knew the greater share of the New Testament from memory.[10]

Third. The Reformed ministers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries could not understand why Anabaptist ideas could not be completely eradicated. They treated it as a passing fancy of the people, but it showed itself more as an age-old religion that was deeply imbedded in the hard heads and true hearts of the Emmental farmers.

Fourth. The idea of Waldensian descent has been handed down by word of mouth as well as in writing through the Anabaptists themselves. The modern Mennonites in Canton Bern hold to this theory although they have had little contact with literature that would have taught them this. It is the story of their origin that has been told by parents to their children for four generations.[11] Thieleman Jansz van Braght, Mennonite minister in Holland during the seventeenth century, in his memorial work entitled *Martyrs' Mirror* (1660) holds to this theory.[12] He was quite close to the events, having compiled and written this memorial work only a little over a hundred years after the Reformation. Although the accuracy of his work has long been questioned, it is gaining more repute in the present day as being an understatement of the facts rather than an exaggeration.

Fifth. Ernst Müller (1849-1927), Reformed pastor of Lang-

[9] *Ibid.*

[10] *Ibid.*

[11] Interview with Hans Rüfenacht, present leading minister of the Emmental Taufgesinnten Gemeinde, Kehr bei Langnau.

[12] Braght, Thieleman Jansz van, *Martyrs' Mirror* (Scottdale, Pa., 1950), 284-87.

nau, made the most thorough study to date of the problem.[13] Not only did he investigate the written evidence, which is too scanty to prove the matter one way or the other, but has brought into his study the more intangible sociological and psychological factors which only a person closely acquainted with the Bernese mind could do. He was convinced that the Bernese Anabaptists have pre-Reformation roots which strongly indicate Waldensian connections.

Sixth. One of the areas in which Waldenses were found in 1430 was also the scene of Anabaptist activity just a century later. This was Schwarzenburg.[14]

It might well be asked why there was no connection between the Anabaptists and the Waldenses after the Reformation. Most of the large group in the Piedmont joined the Reformation in 1532 and lost their identity as Waldenses. In this way they estranged themselves to their brethren in other areas. Those Waldenses who did not join in the Reformation were persecuted and struggled for their existence just as the Anabaptists did in Bern. Neither had much time to think of aiding the other.[15]

Theory of Anabaptism Spreading from Zurich to Bern

During the last half century the theory has taken root especially among American Mennonite historians that Swiss Anabaptism originated in Zurich and was carried to Bern and other areas within the Swiss Confederacy from that place.[16] Those who uphold this theory trace the origin of all Swiss and South German Anabaptism to Conrad Grebel and the small group of men at Zurich who worked with Zwingli in the Reformation until they parted ways because of disagreement on certain points of doctrine as infant baptism, church and state relationship, and participation in war.

Conrad Grebel, the leader of the Zurich group of Anabaptists, was a young man in his mid-twenties who had just completed his university training. Another prominent man in the movement was Felix Manz of Zurich who had also had university training and could handle the ancient languages very well. In 1524 they formally broke with Zwingli. In January, 1525, Grebel, Manz, and others came together near Zurich where they effected an organization.[17] It was not until the following Easter that Roman Catholicism was

[13] Müller, *op. cit.*, 52-69.

[14] Ochsenbein, *op. cit.*, 279.

[15] Müller, *op. cit.*, 68.

[16] Main exponents of this theory have been C. Henry Smith, John Horsch, Richard Feller, and John C. Wenger.

abolished and Zwingli's Reformed state-church actually came into existence at Zurich.

At the same time that the Anabaptists were organizing in Zurich we have evidence that there were Anabaptists in existence in Bern. A letter written at the end of 1524 or beginning of 1525 by Heinrich Bullinger, a leading reformer at Zurich, to Heinrich Simler at Bern mentions that Anabaptist teaching exists in Bern.[18]

The first record we have of Anabaptist leaders from the Zurich group having contact with the Bernese Anabaptists was on January 22, 1528, when Jörg of the House of Jakob (familiarly known as Blaurock) from Chur in the Grisons participated in a debate at Bern. (See page 160 below.) The Bernese had had a number of earlier contacts with Anabaptists from other areas in Switzerland. Most of these were from Basel, and Aarau.

Bern remained officially Catholic until February 7, 1528, when through the efforts of Berchtold Haller it espoused the Zwinglian Reformed state-church religion.[19] But the Bernese council had already dealt with Anabaptist matters while the state was still Catholic. On January 13, 1526, a woman from Zofingen was accused of having herself and her children rebaptized.[20] This predates any known contact of Bernese with non-Bernese Anabaptists. Only two weeks later (January 26), however, Hans Pfistermeyer from Aarau was dealt with for his Anabaptist beliefs.[21]

It should be mentioned, however, that the leading speakers of the early Anabaptist debates in Bern were from non-Bernese territory, indicating that the Bernese Anabaptists had previous contacts with them and that they looked up to these foreign leaders as also their predecessors in the faith.

There is no contradiction in the beliefs or practices of the Zurich and Bernese Anabaptists that can be pointed out. The early confessions of faith and church rules found in Bern, in fact, appear to have come from eastern Switzerland.

The family names of the Bernese Waldenses do not correspond with those of the earliest known Bernese Anabaptists. Only the names of Studer, Neukomm, and Suter among the Waldenses smack of later Anabaptist family names.[22] But family names can not be

[17] Horsch, John, *Mennonites in Europe*, 50.

[18] Simler, Johann Jakob, *Samlung Alter und neuer Urkunden*, II, Ester Theil (Zurich, 1759) 90-92. Original at Zurich Stadtbibliothek.

[19] Theodor de Quervain, *Kirchliche und soziale Zustände in Bern unmittelbar nach der Einführung der Reformation (1528-1536)*, (Bern, 1906), 185. Here is given a reprint of the original reform mandate.

[20] *Ibid.*, 120.

[21] *Ibid.*

relied on to trace Bernese Anabaptism from its beginnings to the present. The few Anabaptist family names that existed immediately after the Reformation which still exist usually only indicate a similarity in region, rarely of direct descent.

It appears then that the antecedents of Bernese Anabaptism go farther back than Reformation times, as does not seem to be the case with Anabaptist history in Zurich. It may well be concluded that there were two strains of Anabaptism in existence during the Reformation period in Bernese territory, the one located in the cities of Bern, Biel, and Aarau and being nourished (and perhaps founded) by Anabaptists from other Swiss cities as Basel and Zurich, and the other movement of a much older origin in the more secluded rural areas in the state of Bern. It was the latter strain that survived two centuries of persecution and has lived on to the present day.[23]

Development of the Anabaptist Movement

As has already been mentioned, the first written evidence of Anabaptists in Bernese territory that has come down to the present day is a letter written toward the end of 1524 or the beginning of 1525 by Heinrich Bullinger, high official of the Zurich state-church, to Heinrich Simler at Bern. In this letter Bullinger mentions that he has heard that Anabaptist teaching is being carried on in Bern and expresses the hope that Simler does not fall into their company. On November 29, 1525, Berchtold Haller wrote to Zwingli concerning the growth of Anabaptism in Bern. He expressed fear that Zwingli's brother-in-law, Lienhard Tremp, would become engrossed in these beliefs.[24]

The Bernese Council first dealt with the Anabaptists on January 13, 1526, when a woman from Zofingen and her children were brought before the council for having been rebaptized. Upon the agreement that she would renounce her rebaptism she was released from her sentence of banishment. Just about two weeks later (January 26) Hans Pfistermeyer from Aarau was banished for his Anabaptist beliefs. The same punishment was meted out to Agnes Zender of Aarau on March 17. At Brugg Jakob Gross from Waldshut was imprisoned about the same time. He was accused of having spoken slanderously about Zwingli and Leo Jud.[25]

[22] Ochsenbein, *op. cit.*, 180-83.

[23] Theory advanced by Christian Lerch, Assistant Archivist, Bernese State Archives.

[24] Berchtold Haller to Zwingli, Nov. 29, 1525, in *Zwingli's Briefvechsel,* II, 441 (*Huldreich Zwingli's Werke,* Band VIII), Leipzig, 1914.

[25] de Quervain, 120, 128.

During the following year there was a definite growth in the number of Anabaptists in Bern. This was due in part to the number that came from Basel. Hans Hansmann (called Seckler because his occupation was that of wallet-maker) and Jakob Hochrütiner, both from Basel, came to Bern. Berchtold Haller, the Bernese Reformer, estimated the number of Anabaptists in the city of Bern to be about twenty on April 25, 1527. At this time Hansmann and Hochrütiner were tried.[26] They were put in a pillory and later led out of the land.[27] On August 14 the cities of Zurich, St. Gall, and Bern together issued a mandate against the Anabaptists.[28] This was the beginning of the systematic punishment and attempt at extermination of the Anabaptists by the government of Bern. The ministers were at first in favor of holding open debates with the Anabaptists to prove their errors to a large number of people rather than bring ignominy on themselves by punishing without a trial. A debate was held on January 22, 1528.[29] This did not seem to aid the purpose of the church officials; so more drastic measures were resorted to, namely, that of capital punishment. Sometime between July 8 and 15, 1529, the first death sentences to Anabaptists in the state of Bern were carried out. Hans Hansmann (called Seckler), Hans Drier (also written Treyer), and Heini Seiler were drowned at Bern.[30] Others were exiled at this time.[31]

In January, 1530, word came to the ears of the Bernese officials that some Anabaptists were coming to Bernese and Solothurn territory from Basel in order to spread their faith. Orders went out to all the prefectures to be on the lookout for these persons.[32] Several were caught. They were Uly Merckly from Rotenfluh, Heini Flügbach from Landberg, Hans Heiden from Niederdorf, and Claus Schwyzer from Liestal.[33] Since Basel was not included in the 1527 agreement against the Anabaptists Bern could not punish them. A long trial lasted from January to November; they were

[26] Staatsarchiv Bern. *Unnütze Papiere* 80/1. This series is hereafter referred to as U.P.

[27] Staatsarchiv Bern. *Ratsmanuale,* April 29 and May 1, 1527. This series is later indicated in this study as R.M.

[28] de Quervain, *op. cit.,* 242-3. Copy of the mandate.

[29] L(eo) v(on) M(uralt), "Das Gesprach mit den Wiedertäufern am 22. Januar 1528 zu Bern." *Zwingliana,* V, No. 9 (1933 No. 1), 409-13.

[30] Supposedly near the northwest base of the old Nydegg bridge in the Aar River. The area of the Blutturm (still standing) has also been suggested.

[31] de Quervain, *op. cit.,* 121.

[32] Staatsarchiv Bern. *Teutsch-Missivbuch* R 467, Jan. 10, 1530. This series is later referred to as T. Miss.

[33] R.M. 224, 193.

finally released after being given the warning that they would be executed if they returned.[34]

A great problem for the Bernese authorities was the attitude of neighboring governments that would not co-operate in the struggle against Anabaptism. Especially was this true of Solothurn. The Anabaptist center there was at Erlinsbach, just across the border. After a very sharp request from Bern, Solothurn agreed to give aid but forbade Bernese police to cross into Solothurn territory.[34]

The method of debating was again tried in July, 1532, in order to prove the errors of the Anabaptists publicly and thus diminish their popularity. This, however, did not prove to be the case as during the next decade the numbers of Anabaptists grew considerably.[35]

In April, 1533, a new policy was introduced by Bern. It was a kind of compromise allowing the Anabaptists protection if they would at least outwardly obey the church ordinances. Anabaptist matters were to a large extent turned over to the prefectures at this time. The big drive was after the ringleaders and ministers of the group. Rather than banish them it was decided that imprisonment should be their sentence. But this did not turn out to be a solution to their problem. Haller wrote to Bucer, "The Anabaptist leader impresses us as being more obstinate and headstrong than learned and meek. Since they have started to imprison them, the jails are filled .... It was decided by the council to dunk[36] all of them, but we were against this. The best and the simplest is advocated by them. Therefore, no one of us wants to stain our religion with blood."[37] More humaneness was also shown at this time. The sick, the pregnant, and wives having small children, were admonished and then left in peace.[38]

The policy again changed on March 5, 1535, when the order was issued that the prefects should be more strict. If the Anabaptist prisoner would not swear to give up his faith within eight days he was to be exiled. If he returned he was to be judged immediately. The men were to be executed by the sword and the women drowned.[39] Then followed the most severe times that the Bernese Anabaptists knew. Special police were sent by the Bernese government and also by the local governments to seek out Anabaptists. For

[34] Müller, *op. cit.*, 32. [35] *Ibid.*, 36.

[36] Method of punishment whereby the prisoner's head is inundated until life is nearly extinct, then revived.

[37] de Quervain, *op. cit.*, 139-40. [38] *Ibid.*, 141-2.

[39] R.M. 251, 29. March 1, 1535.

each one that they caught they received one pound ($15). If they failed to bring back any captives they were paid something for their efforts. It is not known how many were caught in this manner as not all were brought to Bern and the prefectural records in most cases are no longer extant. Neither is it known how many renounced their faith and were thus released. From a study made of existing records it was found that during the years 1534 to 1540 some 158 were imprisoned, 109 were banished, and 20 were executed. But it is obvious that there were many more. They could not be extirpated in this way because those who dwelt near the border would slip over into the neighboring state until conditions became more settled when they would return until another gloomy day came when they would repeat their journey into voluntary exile. This wave of terror only made the Anabaptists more fearless. More definite stands were taken on their faith than ever before. These actions of the state against the Anabaptist found little favor among the people, especially those who had friends among them.[40]

The last debate to be held with the Anabaptists in Bern was from March 11 to 17, 1538. It resembled closely the other debates. A few months later the council complained that despite the debate the Anabaptists' numbers continued to increase.[41]

Hans Franz Nägeli, one of the highest governmental officials of Bern, brought a breathing spell for the Anabaptists. He was sent by the Bernese government to France in 1536 for the purpose of persuading King Francis I to cease persecuting the Huguenots. Through this experience he received a broader view of religious toleration than his colleagues in the Bernese council. On November 28, 1541, he made a speech in the council, the type of which they were not accustomed to hear. Because of this the secretary recorded it in Latin. He spoke at great length on the origin and growth of the Anapabtists in Bernese territory. He pointed out that the main reason for their growth lay in the state clergy itself whose indifference, wicked conduct, and impudence caused persons to turn away from the state church. The same day that he gave his speech a milder interpretation of the earlier mandate was issued.[42]

The influence of Nägeli was short-lived, for already the following May another Anabaptist was forced to forfeit his life because of

[40] de Quervain, *op. cit.*, 142-7.

[41] (Samuel Geiser, ed.) *Die Taufgesinnten-Gemeinden*, 180. For a detailed account of this great debate see Jan P. Matthijssen, "The Bern Disputation of 1538" in *MQR*, XXII (January, 1948), 19-33.

[42] R.M., no. 273, 161-3. Nov. 28, 1541. Staatsarchiv Bern *Mandatenbuch*, Nov. 28, 1541. Hereafter referred to as M.B.

his faith and by September, 1543, at least two more suffered the same punishment.[43]

In 1551 the area from Münsingen and Gross Höchstetten through the entire Emmenthal had a decided growth in the number of Anabaptists. From the pulpits in the prefectures of Signau, Trachselwald, and Brandis an open letter was read stating that each Anabaptist caught would be fined ten pounds ($140), and if they did not renounce their faith, they would be punished by taking their life and possessions. Those who shelter them would be expelled from their homes.[44]

The Anabaptist problem again received attention in 1566, when it was decreed that the brethren were to be banished from Bern and forced to take an oath never to return. Those who broke this oath were to be executed.[45] Representatives were sent by the Bernese government to each of the communes where Anabaptists were known to live, and a thorough house-to-house search was made. All were asked whether they would obey their government and take the oath of allegiance to it; if they refused they were exiled. This did not get rid of all but did keep those who remained very quiet. In October this process ceased.[46]

A law passed in 1567 declared that persons who were not married by the state church would be considered as living in adultery and would be expelled from the land. Their children were to be considered illegitimate and thus prohibited from inheriting estates left by their parents or relatives.[47]

Some twelve years later a mandate was issued against the Anabaptists much resembling those of the past.[48]

In 1581 the council reminded themselves of the arguments of the late Hans Franz Nägeli that they should not always try to find fault with the Anabaptists but rather look at their own corruption, especially that within the state church. The proceedings of this meeting give one a picture of the corruption against which the Anabaptists complained. They deplored the unlearned, uncalled ministers who bought themselves into the clergy, as well as the open sins of the ministry. The council was also reminded that not only the ministry was guilty of great sins but also the government officials.

[43] de Quervain, *op. cit.*, 149.
[44] R.M., no. 364, 79. Feb. 16, 1564.
[45] R.M., no. 369, 34. April 28, 1566. R.M., no. 369, 106. May 27, 1566.
[46] R.M., no. 370, 58-59. Oct. 5, 1566.
[47] T. Miss., no. EE, P. 427-432. March 17, 1567.
[48] R.M., no. 398, 369-72. Dec. 30, 1579.

The result was a new mandate which differed from the others in that it suggested the treatment for staunch Anabaptists should be a term of life imprisonment with little food, or a sentence to the Venetian galleys as oarsmen rather than execution. They said they noticed that the people seeing the executions of Anabaptists had great pity and compassion on them. It was mentioned that the Tertullian saying that "the blood of the martyrs is the seed of the church" seemed to apply to these heretics.[49]

On September 3, 1585, another mandate was issued admitting that the former mandates did not seem to achieve their purpose in doing away with Anabaptist teachings since the Anabaptists continue to gain numerically. The reason was the evil character of the state clergy, according to the mandate. As in past mandates it was stated that Anabaptists should be banished, those who return should be executed without trial, foreign ministers and leaders should be put on the rack and banished after confessions were exacted from them.[50] In actuality the death penalty was not used after 1571 when Hans Haslibacher was beheaded as the last martyr in Bern. (See p. 168 below.)

Migrations of the Bernese Anabaptists in the Sixteenth Century

The question arises as to just what happened to the many Bernese Anabaptists who were driven out of the land during the sixteenth century. A large percentage returned against their oath. At the best they lived hunted lives, but many were at last captured and imprisoned and in rare cases executed. Others fled to other Germanic areas where they were allowed to live quietly. The chief place of refuge during this time was Moravia, where a community had been established by refugees from the west as early as 1526 under the protection of the ruler, Leonhard von Liechtenstein, who in the course of time was himself rebaptized and joined the Anabaptists. Some of the Swiss Anabaptists who went there for protection could not agree with the discipline of the church nor with the lack of the belief in the full nonresistant principle (Hubmaier, the leader, permitted the use of the sword under certain circumstances) so decided to hold their own meetings. Leonard von Liechtenstein told them that they must leave if they would not agree to be part of the older body. The Lords von Kaunitz invited them to come to Austerlitz where they had already given refuge to the exiled Hussites for some eighteen years. Because of their lack

[49] Müller, *op. cit.*, 84-87. [50] M.B., no. 2, 77-82.

of property they pooled their goods and started practicing Christian communism in 1528. Jacob Huter, an Anabaptist from the Tyrol, became the leader of the group in 1533. Through his efforts strict discipline was established, and the group came to be called after his name, Hutterian brethren.[51]

In 1573 and 1576 missionaries from the Hutterian brethren came to Bern to "gather sheep."[52] How many left under this influence one can not tell but it did create enough unrest to receive attention from the government. A directive to hinder the migration was the result. Those leaving would lose their citizenship and would never be accepted in the land again. The persons coming from Moravia were to be imprisoned. Two of the Moravian representatives were caught at Zurzach. They were brought to Baden and after a short trial were drowned.[53]

It appears that the missionaries had success in their enterprise although it was a dangerous one. In a chronicle it is recorded that in 1585 so many Anabaptists arrived in Moravia from Switzerland that they could not accept them all into their communities immediately. In 1586 many more went to Moravia, according to the record.[54]

Records do not exist listing the names or even the numbers of those who left the Bernese state for Moravia. But the names appearing in the Moravian Anabaptist records include the following of Bernese origin: Gerber, Schenk, Hofer, Schlüchter, Born, Amsler, and Baumann.[55]

The history of this group is a long and involved one of migrations and persecutions. From Moravia they moved to Hungary, then on to southern Russia and in 1874 to South Dakota. After the first World War most of them moved to Manitoba and Alberta in Canada because of the severe treatment they received at the hands of local Dakota authorities for not participating in the war effort. There they continue to follow their form of Christian communism established over 400 years ago.[56]

Debates

The early history of many of the Anabaptist groups in Europe was marked by a series of debates with state church officials. This was particularly true in Bern where five such public disputations

[51] Horsch, *op. cit.*, 149-50.

[52] Dr. Josef Beck, *Die Geschichtsbücher der Wiedertäufer in Oesterreich-Ungarn* (Vienna, 1883), 39.

[53] Müller, *op. cit.*, 96.

[54] Beck, *op. cit.*

[55] Beck, *op. cit., passim.*

[56] John Horsch, *The Hutterian Brethren, passim.*

were held during the third and fourth decades of the sixteenth century. Although they followed a pattern of correct legal procedure they could not be conducted in an impartial manner because the accuser was also the judge. Regardless of how ludicrous the Anabaptists made the state church accusers appear there was no chance for winning a decision. But the effect of these disputations was on the whole much more favorable for the Anabaptist movement than for the accusers. The people attending were often profoundly impressed by the simplicity and sincerity of the Biblical Christianity expounded by the Anabaptists and the inability of the arrogant clergy to dispute their beliefs in a logical manner. When the state church finally realized that more harm was being done for their cause than good the debates ceased.

The first debate with the Bernese Anabaptists took place on May 21, 1527. Anabaptists who attended were Bernhardt Sager from Bremgarten, Thomas Schmaler from Murstadt in Franconia (Germany), Hans Hansmann (called Seckler) from Basel, Hans Meyer (called Pfister Meyer) from Aarau, Heini Seiler from Aarau, Hans Töblinger from Fribourg in Uechtland, Ulrich Ueller from Brunen, Jörg of the House of Jacob (Blaurock) from Chur, and Ulrich Honger from Bern. According to Berchtold Haller the Anabaptists were convinced of their errors through public debate and recanted.[57] However, this cannot be true because some, like Blaurock, were executed elsewhere for their faith later on, and several took part in the next debate in Bern.

Church and state officials of Bern held a debate beginning January 7, 1528, which lasted until January 26. At this time it was decided that the church would officially break with Roman Catholicism and become closely allied with the state after Zwingli's pattern in Zurich. Events had been drawing the church at Bern progressively away from Roman Catholic authorities for the five years preceding the actual reform mandate which was put into effect on February 7, 1528.[58] The leading reformer of Bern was Berchtold Haller, minister at the Bern Minster Church. Haller kept in close contact with Zwingli's reform in Zurich, upon which his own work was closely patterned. At the January, 1528, debate everyone was to be given a chance to speak his mind freely as to his convictions on the Reformation. Eight Anabaptists attended. The leaders among them were Jörg of the House of Jacob (called Blaurock) from Chur, Hans Hansmann (called Seckler) from Basel, Hans Pfis-

[57] U.P., 80, 1.

[58] de Quervain, *op. cit.*, 185-93. Reprint of the reform mandate.

termeyer and Heini Seiler from Aarau. Instead of being given a voice in the proceedings they were imprisoned. On Wednesday, January 22, a recess was held from the Catholic-Reformed debate while Zwingli and others dealt with the Anabaptists. After admonishing the Anabaptists they were told that if they would be caught in Bernese territory again they would be drowned without mercy. That the authorities were in earnest can not be doubted as Hans Hansmann (Seckler), Hans Dreier (Treyer), and Heini Seiler were drowned a short time later when they were found in another portion of the state of Bern propagandizing their views.[59]

Hans Pfistermeyer was the main leader of the Bernese Anabaptists by 1530. The Bernese government ordered his arrest. On March 24, 1531, he was arrested through the efforts of Hans Rudolf Segesser at Mellingen and taken to Bern. A debate was held with him by the state church ministers Berchtold Haller, C. Megander, Franz Kolb, Sebastian Hofmeister, and Jakob Otherus. The oath, rebaptism, and other points of difference were discussed. Pfistermeyer declared himself defeated and recanted at this time. But he did not aid in combating the Anabaptists as the authorities had hoped. The results of the debate were printed and greatly publicized.[60]

The various harsh mandates passed against the Anabaptists did not have the effects that were expected. It took many years before the Bernese government came to realize they were dealing with a religious movement and not a crime wave that could be put down with police power. On May 30, 1532, it was agreed by the council to call a meeting at Zofingen with the Anabaptists in July at which time the Bernese authorities would debate against them. Zofingen was chosen instead of Bern to avoid the fear the Anabaptists might have gotten from the injustice done their leaders just four years before when they were imprisoned during the reform debate after having been promised no harm. They were promised safe-conduct to and from Zofingen. Though suspicious of this promise some 23 Anabaptists attended. The leaders were Christian Brügger from Rohrbach and Martin Weniger (called Lincki). Other Anabaptist leaders attending were Hans Hotz, Simon Lantz, and Michael Utt. Brügger was permitted to leave prison to attend the debate. On the state church side the main speaker was Berch-

[59] Geiser, *op. cit.*, 170-71.

[60] *Ein christenlich gespräch gehalten zu Bernn zwüschen den Predicanten unn Hansen Pfyster Meyer von Arouw den Widertauff, Eyd, Oberkeyt und andere Widertöufferische Artickel betreffende* (April 19, 1531). Copy in Goshen College Library.

told Haller. With him were Kaspar Megander, Sebastian Hofmeister from Schaffhausen, Sulzer from Basel, Heinrich Möricker, and others. Haller referred to Weniger as "a learned and crafty man, an eloquent and astounding hypocrite, remarkably gifted at deceiving." The debate lasted from July 1 until July 9. The discussions brought out the beliefs of the Anabaptists. The authority of ordaining ministers was discussed. The state church declared that only the civil authorities could give consent to ordain. The Anabaptists asserted that it is the duty of the Christian church to choose and ordain ministers who qualify. Then the state church representatives tried to prove that the Anabaptists were not a church but a seditious group. The Anabaptists replied that their theory is that the true church is one in which the members show by their words and actions that they are subject to Christ. A true church, they said, can not be identified with the worldly state nor compel anyone to join. The Anabaptists also stressed the importance of church discipline. The state church representatives admitted that corruption existed in their churches, but said it was the duty of the civil government to take care of such matters since it was also Christian. Other topics discussed were the oath and the Christians' responsibilities to civil government. The Anabaptists also disapproved of serfdom. A report of the debate was published and ordered to be read from the pulpits of all churches within Bernese territory.[61] It is reported that many of the people who attended the debate believed that the state church had been shown to be in error. After the debate the Anabaptists were permitted to send a representative to Aarau where the final decision was announced. The person who went was Brügger who was told that he would have the choice of leaving the Anabaptists or being banished if he remained with them. He chose to leave but in the course of time was again found to be in the state of Bern.[62]

Another significant debate was held with the Anabaptists from March 11 until March 17, 1538, at Bern. They were again assured safe-conduct to and from the debate. Thirty-nine Anabaptists appeared. All except five were from Bern. Three came from other parts of the Swiss Confederacy and two from the German Empire. The council entered into this debate with high hopes since Martin Weniger, who played such an important part in the Zofingen debate, had in the meantime joined the state church in Schaffhausen. Eight

[61] *Handlung oder Acta gehaltener Disputation und Gespräch zu Zoffingen inn Berner Biet mit den Widertöuffern* (Froschauer, Zurich, 1532). Copy in the Goshen College Library.
[62] Müller, *op. cit.*, 47-48.

topics were discussed. They included: how much the Old and New Testaments should be obeyed, the method of choosing ministers, what the Holy Christian church is, the meaning of baptism and when and how it should be administered, the oath, whether a Christian may be a government official, and the ban. The debate itself was very similar to the one held some six years previous. Most of the same topics were discussed and very few new arguments were introduced by either side. The state ministers were very disappointed that none of the Anabaptists changed sides. The decision given was "that the Anabaptists had refused to accept teaching from the Scriptures and refused to confess their errors." The threat was again made that if any should return who had been banished they would be put to death without mercy. Although the Anabaptists were promised a copy of the proceedings this was denied them.[63]

Because of the utter failure (so far as the state church officials were concerned) of this last debate with the Anabaptists, added to the fact that the Anabaptist faith was actually being propagandized through the debates, it was decided not to hold any more such open meetings.[64]

Punishment

The price to pay in order to be an Anabaptist in the state of Bern during the sixteenth century was often not a small one. At least forty paid with their lives. Countless others were imprisoned and later banished if they refused to join the state church.

Mandates were frequently issued by the Bernese council giving orders on how the local authorities should deal with the Anabaptists. There was some fluctuation from year to year in the severity of the orders. During periods of war threat the mandates were more severe. The authorities soon found that extreme cruelty did not diminish the numbers. Neither did the use of more humane methods solve their problem of exterminating Anabaptist beliefs.

The general pattern followed by the mandates was this: first, imprisonment with the opportunity to renounce their faith; second, banishment from Bernese territory with a forced oath never to return; third, if the Anabaptist returned he was charged with breaking his oath and was to be punished by the death sentence without trial.

[63] U.P. (80.) This is the official copy. Two reports made by secretaries appear in U.P. 80. See also Jan Matthijssen, "The Bern Disputation of 1538," *Mennonite Quarterly Review,* XXII, 1 (January, 1948), 19-33.

[64] Müller, *op. cit.,* 79-81.

In the actual execution of the mandates great variation took place. The ministers and leaders of the Anabaptists were always treated with greater cruelty than were members. The rack was sometimes used to exact confessions. The pillory was used as a rather standard punishment for those who broke their oath and returned. Death by water or sword was reserved for those who were especially obstinate and dangerous in the sight of the officials.

The reasons for the cruel treatment of a minority group that was essentially innocent are quite clear. The state church clergy would always insist that it was a matter of saving souls who were lost outside their church. Actually the main reason was fear by the clergy of losing their monopolistic position on things religious in certain areas if this movement was left uncontrolled. It appeared that this could easily happen as the number of Anabaptist sympathizers and friends seems to have been large, especially in the rural areas. The authorities feared the loss of army manpower especially during wartime if Anabaptism should go uncontrolled.

Through a very fortunate incident a list of the Anabaptists who suffered the death penalty at Bern has been preserved. Hans Lörsch (Lötscher) from Latterbach was a prisoner for quite some time at the *Waisenhaus* (orphanage) in Bern before being taken away in chains as a galley slave. In 1667 while a prisoner he had the opportunity to go through the *Turmbücher* (prison records) and copy the names of the Anabaptists who had been killed at Bern. Through some unknown means this list was given to Christian Kropf, an Anabaptist who was not a prisoner, and then found its way into the first German edition of the *Märtyrerspiegel* (*Martyrs' Mirror*) printed at Ephrata, Pennsylvania, in 1748.[65]

The list of the forty martyrs together with additional notes concerning them follow:

1. Hans Hansmann (called Seckler) from Basel; drowned July, 1529, in the Aar River in Bern.[66] In a letter from Haller to Zwingli dated April 25, 1527, he was called the leader of the Anabaptists. He was one of the eight Anabaptists who attended the great disputation at Bern in 1528 when it was decided to change the church from Roman Catholicism to a Reformed state church.

[65] Tielman Jansz van Braght, *Der blutige Schauplatz oder Märtyrerspiegel der Taufgesinnten* (Ephrata, Pa., 1748), (Scottdale, Pa., 1950), 1129-1130.

[66] See note 7. Also see Geiser, *op. cit.*, 171. Lerch claims the old Nydegg bridge to have been the scene of the drownings while Geiser maintains it to have been the Blutturm.

He took part in the Anabaptist debate of 1528 at Bern; his views are recorded in the record of that debate.[67]

2. Hans Dreier (Treyer) from Aarau; drowned July, 1529, in the Aar River at Bern. He attended the debate of 1528 where he was examined. His views were recorded in the same manner as those of Hans Hansmann.[68]

3. Heinrich Seiler, a hatmaker from Aarau; drowned July, 1529, in the Aar River in Bern. His examination reveals his views as is the case of the above two whom it appears were drowned at the same time.[69]

4. Conrad Eichacher (Eicher) from Steffisburg; drowned on February 21, 1530, in the Aar River at Bern. He was a minister of the Bernese Anabaptists. The trial against him started in August, 1529. He was released on October 18 when he declared that he had erred.[70] But on December 30 he was again arrested and put on trial until the following February when he was put to death.[71]

5 and 6. Two Anabaptists from the district of Bipp were executed at Bern sometime between 1530 and 1535.[72]

7. Moritz Kessler from Sumiswald; executed at Bern in March, 1535. On October 12, 1532, Kessler promised to stay away from the Anabaptists but only a month later (November 20) he was threatened with banishment for not having his child baptized. In February, 1533, he was arrested for perjury and with his wife and child was exiled. For two years nothing more is mentioned about him in the records. But on April 1, 1535, it was recorded that Kessler's wife left the Anabaptists and had her child baptized. His name is conspicuously absent but in the records of money disbursed to the gravedigger during this period a sum is mentioned as having been paid for the burial of "the Kessler."[73]

8. Ulrich Schneider from Lützelfluh; executed by the sword at Bern likely in March, 1535. No more definite information is known concerning him. It is recorded that "a Schnider" was imprisoned at Aarburg with Hägerly, number 10 in this list.[74]

[67] Dr. Adolf Fluri, "Täuferhinrichtungen in Bern im 16 Jahrhundert," *Berner Heim* 1896, No. 35, 279-80; No. 36, 284-5.

[68] *Ibid.*, No. 35, 280; No. 36, 284-5.

[69] *Ibid.*

[70] de Quervain, *op. cit.*, 123.

[71] Fluri, *op. cit.*, No. 37, 292-4.

[72] de Quervain, *op. cit.*, 153.

[73] *Ibid.*, 153-4. After March 13, 1535, a law was in effect that Anabaptist men should be executed by the sword and women by drowning. Until this time all were executed by drowning.

[74] *Ibid.*, 154. Also Jakob Heiz, *Täufer im Aargau* (Aarau, 1902), 132.

9. A young man from the Valais (Wallis) was executed by the sword at Bern in March, 1535. This record could also be interpreted to mean that this man was from the Anabaptist family named Wallis of Liestal.[75]

10. Högerli (Hagerley) from Aarburg. On August 8, 1534, a record states that he was jailed for the third time because of Anabaptist ideas. He was taken to Bern on August 10, 1534. It appears that he was executed after the harsh mandate of March 13, 1535, but further details are lacking.[76]

11. Moritz Losenegger, a zealous Anabaptist minister from near Langnau, was executed on May 2, 1536, at Bern. His name is first mentioned on December 20, 1532, when he was imprisoned at Thun for perjury, having been deported and returned contrary to his oath. On January 8 he was released supposedly because the Thun clergy convinced him to give up his Anabaptist ideas. In the autumn of 1535 he was rebaptized at Trachselwald. His arrest was immediately ordered but not until shortly before his execution does it appear that it was possible to take him to Bern. The captor received eight pounds ($120) instead of the usual one pound ($15).[77]

12. Bernhard Wälti from Rüderswil was executed July 7, 1537, at Bern.

13. Hans Schweizer from Rügsau was likely executed either in July or August, 1537, at Bern.

14. Jürg Hoffser from Obergallbach in the district of Signau was executed at Bern on August 28, 1537.

15. Ulrich Bichsel was executed at Bern during the latter part of 1537 or the forepart of 1538.[78]

16. Barbeli Willher from Hasli was drowned at Bern during the same period as number 15 above. Perhaps this Barbara or the one following is the one referred to as "Barbli with the wooden leg" who was banished twice.

17. Barbeli from Sumiswald living at Studen near Biel was drowned at Bern during the same period as numbers 15 and 16.

18. Catharina Friedli Imhoff was drowned at Bern during the same period as the above-mentioned persons.

19. Verena Iseli from Schüpbach near Signau was drowned at Bern during the latter part of 1537 or forepart of 1538.

[75] Paul Burckhardt, *Die Basler Täufer* (Basel, 1898), 25.

[76] de Quervain, *op. cit.*, 154.

[77] *Ibid.*, 155.

[78] No additional information is known concerning numbers 12, 13, 14, 15 besides that given in the *Martyrs' Mirror.*

20. Ulrich from Rüegsau was put to death at Bern during the same period as those above.

21. Cunss Seidenkohen from Constance was executed at Bern on March 28, 1538.[79]

22. Peter Stucki living at Wimmis was executed at Bern on April 16, 1538. Perhaps this is the same Peter Stucki from Oberdiessbach mentioned as attending the Anabaptist debate in March, 1538.[80]

23. Ulrich Huber from Röthenbach in the district of Signau was executed at Bern sometime between April and August, 1538.

24. Hans Willer. Executed at Bern in August, 1538.

25. Elsbeth Küpfer from Sumiswald was drowned at Bern in the latter part of 1538.

26. A wife from Sumiswald was executed by drowning at Bern on May 28, 1538.

27. A wife from Gross Höchstetten was drowned at Bern the latter part of 1538.

28. Peter Wessenmiller (Wyssmüller?) from Wimmis was executed at Bern on September 17, 1538.[81]

29. Stäffen Rüegsegger was put to death at Einigen on November 8, 1538. He attended the Anabaptist debate at Bern in March, 1538.[82]

30. A person from the district of Signau was put to death at Bern late in 1538.

31. A person from Sumiswald was executed at Bern late in 1538.

32. Rudolf Iseli from the Tannental was executed at Bern late in 1538.[83]

33. Lorenz Aeberli from Grüner was executed at Bern on June 3, 1539. He was imprisoned in 1533 but released when he took an oath. He also took part in the Anabaptist debate in March, 1538.[84]

34. Hans Schuhmacher from Wynstägen near Safenwil in Aargau was executed at Bern sometime during the period 1539 to 1542. Other members of this family moved to Thürnen in what is now Canton Basel-Land.[85]

[79] No additional information is known concerning numbers 17, 18, 19, 20, 21 besides that given in the *Martyrs' Mirror.*

[80] U.P. 80 a. See list of participants.

[81] Note 79 also applies to numbers 23 through 28.

[82] See note 57.

[83] Note 79 also applies to numbers 30, 31, 32.

[84] U.P. 80 a. See list of participants.

[85] Heiz, *op. cit.,* 54.

35. A person from Oberbipp was executed at Bern on May 1, 1542.

36. Peter Anken from the Siebental was executed by the sword at Bern sometime during 1542 or 1543.

37. Christian Oberlen (Oberli) was executed at Bern on September 17, 1543.

38. Hans Anken from Amsoldingen was executed at Bern sometime between 1543 and 1566.

39. Wälti Gerber from the Streithalden near Röthenbach in the district of Signau was executed at Bern on July 30, 1566. For a time he was the leading Anabaptist minister in the Emmental. In 1564 a notice went out to the various districts to arrest him and bring him to Bern.[86]

40. Hans Haslibacher from Haslibach in the district of Sumiswald was beheaded at Bern on November 20, 1571. He was an old Anabaptist minister. The first notice concerning his Anabaptist activities appears in 1532. He is on the list of those who attended the Anabaptist debate of 1538.[87] Numerous notices appear concerning his final arrest. The most vivid description of his imprisonment and death is given in a poem written by one of his fellow Anabaptist prisoners. It has been set to music and included in the hymnbook of the Anabaptists commonly known as the *Ausbund*.[88]

In the above list of forty executed Anabaptists only thirty-one names are given. Seven have been verified by other records than the list itself that they were put to death.[89] Another six are mentioned in the records as having been Anabaptists.[90] Still another eight carry known Anabaptist family names.[91] There remain ten which until now have no other proof than the list as given in the *Martyrs' Mirror*. Considering the few records that exist from these times and the many gaps in the ones that were preserved this is a rather high percentage of verified cases. It proves beyond a doubt that the list was not padded. There is some evidence that there were more put to death than the list shows.[92]

Although the death sentence remained in effect until the eighteenth century it was only a threat after 1571 as it was not used after this time in the state of Bern. Other forms of punishment

[86] Fluri, *op. cit.* Nos. 38 and 40.
[87] See note 61.
[88] Fluri, *op. cit.*, No. 40. Geiser, *op. cit.*, 176, 179, 182-7, 191.
[89] See numbers 1, 2, 3, 4, 11, 39, 40.
[90] See numbers 7, 10, 22, 29, 33, 34.
[91] See numbers 8, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 24.
[92] de Quervain, *op. cit.*, 148-58. Fluri, *op. cit.*, Nos. 35, 36, 37, 38, 40.

continued. Dunking was practiced. The rack is mentioned as being used for exacting information and confessions. The pillory was the common punishment for breaking the oath which was the crime Anabaptists were charged with committing if they returned from banishment. At least one Anabaptist had his ear cut off for his stubbornness.[93] The punishment that followed the above methods (according to some contemporaries) was even more cruel than the death sentence. This was the selling of Anabaptist men to the Venetian galleys to work for several years as oarsmen slaves.

Beliefs and Confessions of Faith

The two sources of knowledge of the theological position of the sixteenth century Bernese Anabaptists are their own rules and confessions of faith, and secondly, the reports on their debates and trials. As the debates and trials were recorded only by state church secretaries it can be justly concluded that many omissions and additions were made to the disfavor of the Anabaptists. The rules and confessions of faith are few but together these sources do give a glimpse of their spirit during this period.

An old list of seven principles that is presumed to have been written during the decade of the 1520's has been preserved at the Bernese State Archives. The general tone is that of a live, energetic, Bible-centered group reminding one of early Apostolic Christianity. The author of these rules is not known. The manuscript seems to have been written by the same hand that wrote the copy of the 1527 Schleitheim Confession of faith also at the Bernese State Archives. The essence of the seven articles follows:

> "1. The brethren and sisters should meet at least three or four times each week to study the teachings of Christ and His apostles and admonish each other in the Lord.
>
> "2. When the brethren and sisters come together they should read something they understand which God has laid on their heart. The others should remain quiet and listen so that not two or three are speaking at the same time and hinder the others from hearing. The psalter should be read daily by all.
>
> "3. No one should be frivolous in the church of God, whether with words or deeds. Good behaviour should be shown, also before the heathen.
>
> "4. When a brother does another brother wrong he should be admonished after the manner of Christ and punished in a Christian and brotherly way. This is the duty of each.

[93] R.M. 427, 279.

"5. The brethren and sisters should not have anything that belongs to them alone, but rather they should have all things in common as was the case with the Christians during Apostolic times. There should be a church purse to be used for those who are truly in need. As in the time of the Apostles, no brother should be left in want.

"6. The food for meals during times of meeting should be furnished by the brethren at whose home the meeting is held. A soup or cabbage and meat should be given in small quantities as eating and drinking are not the kingdom of heaven.

"7. The Lord's Supper should be observed as often as the brethren come together in order to proclaim the death of the Lord. This should be an admonition for each to meditate on, for as Christ has given His life for us, and has shed His blood for us, we should be willing to give Him our love and our life. All the Brethren should be willing to do this for Christ's sake."[94]

The earliest confession of faith that the Bernese Anabaptists are known to have used is one that was compiled under the direction of Michael Sattler of Stauffen in Baden on February 24, 1527, at "Schlatten am Randen."[95] At this time a synod of Swiss and south German Anabaptists was held.[96] The seven articles included in this statement of faith are summarized as follows:

1. Baptism. All those should be baptized who have repented and amended their life after they request it. All infant baptism is excluded.

2. Ban. The ban shall be used with all those who have given themselves to the Lord and allow themselves to call each other brother and sister but have nevertheless fallen into error and sin. They shall be admonished privately twice and the third time disciplined before the entire church after the instruction in Matthew 18. But such is to take place before the Lord's Supper so all may come in a spirit of oneness to partake of this holy ordinance.

3. Communion. In the breaking of bread we are united. All who wish to break bread will do it to the remembrance of the broken body of Christ and all who will drink will do it to the memory of the shed blood of Christ. They should have previously been united through baptism to the church of God of which Christ is the head.

[94] U.P. 80, No. 5. Copied in Müller, *op. cit.*, 37, 38.

[95] It has long been a controversial issue among Anabaptist historians whether Schlatten am Randen refers to the present town of Schleitheim in Canton Schaffhausen (which when spoken in the local dialect sounds similar to Schlatten) or whether it was the present village of Schlatt am Randen, Bezirk Engen, Land Baden, Germany, near the border of Canton Schaffhausen. Most German Anabaptist historians favor the latter while supporters of the former theory are principally Swiss. See *Corpus Reformatorum,* XCIII, *Huldreich Zwingli Sämtliche Werke,* VI, 102/103 (1936), 103ff. Geiser, *op. cit.,* 313. John C. Wenger, "The Schleitheim Confession of Faith," *The Mennonite Quarterly Review,* XIX, No. 4 (October, 1945), 245-6. According to Wenger, Dr. Fritz Blanke "has shown conclusively that Schlaten is simply the local dialect designation for Schleitheim, a Swiss village near Schaffhausen."

[96] U.P. 80, No. 9. Copy in Müller, *op. cit.,* 38-42. English translation is given in Wenger, *op. cit.,* 247-53.

4. Separation. One should abstain from all the evil and wickedness that the devil has planted in the world. All that is not united with God and Christ are an abomination which we should avoid. This includes all popish and anti-popish works and meetings, inns, duties to unbelievers, and other similar things. We shall also avoid the weapons of authority as the sword, armor, and things of that nature for friends or against enemies. In the strength of the Word of God: You should not resist evil.

5. Pastors in the church of God. The pastor of the church of God shall follow the orders of Paul. He should have a good report of those not of the faith. This office shall be to read, admonish, give communion, teach, punish or ban in the church. He shall do all to serve the Gospel and shall also live as the Lord has ordained. If a pastor is to be disciplined there should be at least two or three present. If he has sinned he should be punished before all so that others may have fear. If the pastor is exiled or if he is directed home through the cross, another should from that hour on be put in his place.

6. The sword. The sword is ordained from God to punish and kill the evil and protect and fight for the good. But in the perfection of Christ the ban is used to warn and exclude those who have sinned. Governmental officials are of the world; Christians of the spirit. Those of the world are armed with steel and iron but the Christians are armed with the armor of God which are truth, righteousness, peace, holiness, and the Word of God.

7. The oath. Christ forbids the pious to swear, whether it be true or false, whether by heaven or the earth. Christ has said that our speech should be yes, yes and no, no.

In 1568 a meeting of Anabaptist ministers and elders of south Germany and Switzerland was held at Strasbourg. At that time a list of rulers of order was decided upon which came into general use among the Anabaptists of Switzerland. These rules were copied and recopied so that each congregation might have a copy. In 1607 another conference was held at Strasbourg at which time these rules were slightly revised. Numerous copies have been preserved. It has always been known as *Abred der Diener und Eltesten von vielen Orten in der Versammlung zu Strassburg anno 1568.*[97] The first indication that the Anabaptists stressed plainness in attire is perhaps the chief difference in this list of rules from previous ones.

The other main source for our knowledge of the sixteenth century theological views and religious practices of the Bernese Anabaptists is gained from a study of the testimonies they gave at the various debates and trials. It is interesting to note the very close agreement in each point among the various leaders whose

[97] See Müller, *op. cit.*, 50-52. Also Harold S. Bender, "Source Material for Mennonite History: I. The Discipline Adopted by the Strasburg Conference of 1568." *Mennonite Quarterly Review*, I, No. 1 (January, 1927), 57-66. English translation with the original text.

testimonies have been preserved. In no point do they differ from the confessions of faith and list of church rules referred to above.[98]

Spread of Bernese Anabaptism in the Sixteenth Century

Within ten years after the first mention of Anabaptism in Bernese records we find that it spread into many sections of the state. The first record (1526) mentions a woman in Zofingen who held views on Anabaptism. At about the same time mention is made of Anabaptists in Lenzburg and Aarau which were a part of the state of Bern at that time. In 1527 an estimated twenty Anabaptists were in the city of Bern.[99] Especially during the years following 1531 did the Anabaptists make many converts. In 1532 orders on how to deal with the Anabaptists went to the following district offices: Aarburg, Thun, Unterseen, Interlaken, Hasli, Oberland, Trachselwald, and Signau. In 1533 similar orders were sent to Burgdorf, Aarburg, Brandis, Sumiswald, Signau, Aargau, Wangen, Aarwangen, and Zofingen. In 1534 orders were sent to Aarwangen, Trachselwald, Trub, Burgdorf, Brandis, Signau, Sumiswald, and Höchstetten. In 1536 the districts of Biberstein, Seftingen, and Schwarzenburg were included in similar orders.[100] In 1538 Anabaptists were found in the following districts: Thun (especially at Steffisburg), Burgdorf, Lenzburg, Aarburg, Frutigen, Wangen (especially at Roggwil), Sumiswald (numerous), Bipp, Münsterthal, Signau (many), Trachselwald (numerous).[101]

As the century progressed the Emmental became ever more the asylum for the Bernese Anabaptists. In the deep valleys and on more inaccessible highland farms as well as the vicinity of the Lucerne border they found methods of hiding and evading the police. Only in this section were they able to carry on a continuous organization during the three centuries of ruthless intolerance that followed. Anabaptist groups in other sections of Bern lasted well into the seventeenth century and some even into the eighteenth century. But as they were slowly but surely annihilated in Zurich so were they eventually exterminated in Bern outside of the Emmental.

[98] *Cf.* Müller, *op. cit.*, 42-45.

[99] Letter dated April 25, 1527, from B. Haller to H. Zwingli. *Zwingli Werke*, IX, 104.

[100] Müller, *op. cit.*, 72.

[101] U.P. 80[1]. Included in the report of the Anabaptist debate of 1538 held in Bern.

THE MENNONITE COMMONWEALTH IN RUSSIA 1789-1914

A SOCIOLOGICAL INTERPRETATION*

E. K. Francis

The migrations of Mennonites from West Prussia to the Russian Ukraine cannot be interpreted simply as the wholesale transfer of a distinct social system with its personnel and institutions from one locale to another. The supra-localistic Mennonite system in West Prussia as well as most of the local communities described earlier apparently continued to exist relatively undisturbed throughout and after the exodus of a large portion of their members. On the other hand, the bands of emigrants were usually assembled *ad hoc* comprising elements from different places and with slightly different backgrounds. In fact, in order to facilitate the co-operation and amalgamation among the members of different, and at times antagonistic, Mennonite congregations, the Russian emissary at Danzig, von Trappe, requested from the rigoristic *Oude Vlaamsche Doopsgezinde Gemeente* in Amsterdam a recommendation that intermarriage between members of the Frisian and Flemish congregations among the emigrants should be permitted.[1] This leads to the conclusion that the Mennonite social system in Russia was secondary and indigenous, very much like the ethnic groups and subsystems which later on sprang up in America. The new organization, of course, was aided in its formation by the relative homogeneity and common traditions of the original participants. Moreover, the new system continued to be perceived as somehow connected with the old one; the flow of emigrants from the old country during many decades, familial and sentimental ties, common religious interests, the practice of mutual aid among all Mennonite congregations, com-

* The following article is a section taken from Chapter I, "From Religious Movement to Ethnic Group," of the author's forthcoming book *In Search of Utopia: The Mennonites in Manitoba.* The advance publication was authorized by the Historical and Scientific Society of Manitoba in Winnipeg, who have been sponsoring the research project. The editors of the *Review* welcome this opportunity of drawing the readers' attention to this study which, in their opinion, promises to be the most thorough and complete sociological analysis of any individual Mennonite community ever made. The book will be published in a series on ethnic groups of Manitoba by the University of Toronto Press. (Editorial Note)

[1] Cf. D. H. Epp, *Die Chortitzer Mennoniten: Versuch einer Darstellung des Entwicklungsganges derselben* (Rosenthal, 1888), pp. 39ff. This incident also shows the close association which at the time was still maintained between the Mennonites in West Prussia and their Dutch mother churches.

munication through correspondence and travelers—all this supported the impression of the unity, if not the identity, of these two systems and generated a we-feeling and sense of solidarity among the communities in both countries for several generations. In West Prussia the Mennonites became more and more integrated into the larger society until all that made them distinguishable from other Germans there was their religious beliefs and practices. Their brethren in Russia, however, developed into a separate people,[2] socially independent and clearly distinct from both the larger Russian society and other German-speaking colonies in that country.

Two factors seem to be above all responsible for this emergence of a closed Mennonite social system in Russia. Subjectively the Mennonite immigrants were motivated not only by the desire to escape the threat to their religious principles and economic welfare, but also by the positive hope, always present among the sectarians, of finally realizing the utopian community suggested by the moral and social ideals of their religion, without outside interference and independently from the wicked "world." Objectively they were confronted with a legal framework provided by the Russian government which not only permitted the almost complete segregation of

[2] Leonhard Froese proposes (apparently following an earlier suggestion made by this author to whom he refers in a note) to designate the Russian Mennonites as a *Volksgruppe* (ethnic group) rather than a *Volk* (people). He defines the ethnic group as "a natural ethnic unit, reaching phylogenetically beyond the stage of a tribe, without however achieving that of a people." According to him, the ethnic group is distinguished by the fact that it is not yet separated from the *Hauptvolk*, that is, the people from which it has gone out. (*Das pädagogische Kultursystem der mennonitischen Siedlungsgruppe in Russland* [Ph.D. thesis, Göttingen, 1949], p. XII. Copy in Goshen College Library.). We would agree with Froese in so far as an ethnic group (in the narrower sense) appears as a social subsystem relatively open against some other, more inclusive, social system or people. However, the ethnic group may or may not be connected with a distant *Hauptvolk*, while it is always connected to some degree territorially, and thus economically, politically, and in other respects, with a different people. It is, moreover, quite erroneous to treat, following in the footsteps of Tönnies, ideal types as "phylogenetic" stages of social development. The genesis of an ethnic group may be due to disturbances of a social system because of migrations or political change. It may, however, also be the result of spontaneous divisions within a social system leading to the formation of new subsystems without any addition of foreign ethnic elements.

Froese's question whether the Mennonite ethnic group is to be considered as "Dutch, German, Dutch-German, or German-Dutch" is misconceived. Its formulation is proof in itself that the Mennonite social system in Russia had actually little inner connection with a *Hauptvolk* since Froese himself is unable to define such a *Hauptvolk* for it. The Mennonite system in Russia cannot therefore be considered as an ethnic group in the specific sense given to the term by Froese, but is much more like an independent people than anything else. The designation of ethnic group in our own earlier writings was chosen as a generic term in view of the situation in Canada rather than in Russia. Moreover, it could be justified in so far as the closure of this system was never quite as complete as is usual for a people; but not because of its social dependence on a *Hauptvolk*. For the Russian Mennonite system was not really a part of the German people, certainly not of the Dutch people, while no such thing as a German-Dutch or Dutch-German *Haupvolk* ever existed. (See also our discussion of the emergence of the Dutch and German nations in the earlier sections of this chapter.)

homogeneous groups but tended to increase and protect their homogeneity, closure, and self-sufficiency. The utopian aspirations of the Mennonites are known from previous discussions. The political and economic conditions under which they tried to realize them, not entirely successfully, require a further careful analysis.

The provisions of the Colonial Law, enacted first on March 19, 1764, enlarged and amended in 1800, 1801, and 1803, and finally incorporated in the Russian code of law of 1842, were by no means entirely different from anything the Mennonites had known in the past. While regulating their whole way of life in great detail, the Russian government nevertheless did not impress the law upon the Mennonites exclusively from above. On the contrary, this law was the work of eminent jurists, many of them Baltic noblemen of German extraction, who had an intimate knowledge of German agrarian history in the East, and were guided by a living tradition of colonial organization. Although certain improvements and modifications were made, the Colonial Law of Russia was an adaptation of the traditional solidaristic form of settlement and community organization familiar to the immigrants and readily adopted by them. In addition, the authorities were quite flexible in the application of the law. They were anxious to learn by their mistakes, to consult the settlers themselves, and to make adjustments in the legal and administrative practices wherever necessary. In this process of constant readjustment the Mennonite colonies occupied an extraordinary position. A. Klaus, a high Russian official in the colonial administration and a keen student of society, remarked later that the Russian government, "convinced of the surprisingly quick success of Mennonite economy, took their institutions, up to a certain degree, as a model for the organization of the majority of the other colonies of foreigners in the Ukraine."[3]

The Russian program of colonization was primarily concerned with the type of peasant farmer, at the time still prevalent in Central and Eastern Europe, who, living not only on or from his land but also with his land, was a conserver rather than exploiter of the soil; whose ideas of wealth and well-being cannot be expressed in terms of capital, profit, comfort, and consumption but who draws his satisfaction from pride in work done well, from improvement and increase of his holdings and herds, from the responsible management of a large household, and from the knowl-

[3] *Unsere Kolonien: Studien und Materialien zur Geschichte und Statistik der ausländischen Kolonisation in Russland*, translated from the Russian edition of 1869 by J. Töws (Odessa, 1887), pp. 163f. Copy in the Goshen College Library.

edge of having provided for future generations. The social system envisaged by this program was familistic, localistic, and solidaristic, the units of social, as well as economic and political organization were accordingly the farm family, the village commune, and the colony. The latter was the basic unit of administration, taxation, and the seat of lower courts. Above the district (since 1871 called volost) there was the bureaucratic system of the imperial government. On the volost level local government elected from below met with the agents of central administration appointed and directed from above, the *Oberschulze* with the council of mayors and other representatives of villages on the one hand, the inspector or superintendent responsible to the governor on the other. After some experimentation and many mistakes, the foreign colonies in New Russia were completely separated from the jurisdiction of the governors. Instead a special bureau, first under the Department of the Interior, later under that of Crown Lands, was established under the name of *Popechitelnyi Komitet o Kolonistakh Iuzhnago Kraia Rossii.*[4] Its system of administration was a benevolent paternalism in the humane, yet progressive, spirit of the Enlightenment, mainly concerned with peace and order, as well as the improvement of industry and economy, but otherwise encouraging initiative and self-government among the settlers without encroaching upon the inner religious and cultural life of the colonies. The authorities dealt but rarely with individuals but treated the colonies, and within them the villages, as corporate bodies and legal persons, represented by their own elected officers.

The village commune was the actual owner of all the land within its boundaries. Some of it was parcelled out in holdings of 175 acres each and given to individual families in permanent usufruct. Such land had to remain in the family, could neither be divided, nor sold nor mortaged, and fell back to the commune if and when a family died out. Other tracts of land were reserved for communal pastures, sheep ranges, haylands, roads, churches, schools, mills, distilleries, and other industrial establishments. Small lots were provided for cotters, artisans, and landless folk of all kinds. The village assembly, to which each landholding family delegated a representative, exercised a large degree of control over the economic, social, and cultural life of all inhabitants. The elected chair-

[4] While David G. Rempel translates this as Guardian's Committee, Kreider uses the term Advisory Committee: German writers refer to it as *Fürsorge-Commite für ausländische Kolonisten,* a term which apparently was the translation used in official Russian documents. Bureau of Colonization may be considered a more suggestive equivalent.

man of the assembly, the *Dorfschulze,* acted not only as chief executive officer and mayor but also as tax collector, justice of the peace, and police judge. In his judiciary capacity he was assisted by a sort of jury appointed from among the "best people" in the village. Close habitat and the open-field system which was introduced into the Mennonite settlements shortly after their first immigration, partly as a protection against the as yet insecure conditions in the country, partly in response to a definite government policy, further increased their inner coherence and quickly molded the whole group into a well-integrated social organism.

Details of the arrangements under which the Mennonites in Russia lived and flourished, however interesting and revealing they may be, cannot be included in this description. Yet, many of their most characteristic institutions were later transferred to Manitoba and will have to be dicussed in their proper place.[5] Two other points, however, require immediate attention, the role of leadership and that of institutionalized religion. Both the paternalistic nature of government and the traditions of the Mennonite sect were rather adverse to the cultivation of strong leader personalities. Like the Puritans of New England, the Mennonites were a movement of plain folk under elected lay preachers and organized according to strictly democratic, equalitarian, and congregational principles. They were adverse as much to higher learning as to worldly ambitions and conspicuous behavior among their members. As peasant farmers they had moreover little incentive or opportunity to develop an upper class or intelligentsia providing the ground and climate in which ambitious and powerful personalities would thrive. Thus, during their Russian period only one man stands out as a really influential shaper of their destiny, Johann Cornies. And even in his case, the resistance of the group and its religious leaders was overcome only through the direct interference of Tsar Alexander I who not only took interest in the progress of the Mennonite colonies but had great personal confidence in the successful businessman and farmer of the Molotschna colony.

The institution through which Cornies pushed his economic and cultural reforms, with the full backing of an autocratic government, was the *Verein zur Erhöhung von Landwirtschaft und*

[5] See also E. K. Francis, "Mennonite Institutions in Early Manitoba: A Study in Their Origins," *Agricultural History,* 22 (1948): 144-55. A very full and scholarly statement may be found in the unfortunately unpublished Ph.D. dissertation by David G. Rempel, *The Mennonite Colonies in New Russia: A Study of Their Settlement and Economic Development from 1789 to 1914* (Stanford University, 1933); for other references, largely rare, consult Rempel's bibliographical appendix. Copy in the Goshen College Library.

Gewerbe. Its historical name *Landwirtschtsverein* (Agricultural Union) is actually due to an error of translation from the official Russian designation. For it actually was a Board of Trade and Agriculture instituted by the *Fürsorge-Commité* in Odessa in order to supersede the autonomous local authorities wherever their conservativism threatened to stymie and stifle economic progress. Through these boards, established in each colony, Cornies was able to force his fellow Mennonites to adopt new farming methods including the use of fertilizers and a four-crop rotation with summer fallow, and to improve buildings, water supply, sanitation, and fire protection. His manifold interests and activities extended, however, also to matters of social welfare and schooling. In particular he was the instigator of institutions of higher education in the various colonies, forerunners of the *Zentralschulen* of later fame. In 1859 these were finally recognized as official normal schools for the training of Mennonite teachers, and by 1870 the Mennonite school system was superior to any one that existed at the time in the rural districts of Russia.

When Cornies died in 1848, the Mennonite colonies in Russia were on the way to becoming the most prosperous and economically best balanced rural communities in all of Russia, the prize exhibit of the colonization authorities. In 1874 one visitor described the Molotschna colony as follows: "The dwelling houses were large brick structures with tile roofs, a flower garden between the street and the house, and [a] well-kept vegetable garden and orchard in the rear. The stable with splendid work horses of heavy build, and the shed with vehicles of all descriptions, among them family coaches and all kinds of American farming machinery. They were certainly the best appointed farm communities I had seen anywhere. Scattered over the country were large isolated estates, with buildings reminding one of the feudal baronial castles of Western Europe. Their owners were millionaire Mennonites who had acquired large tracts of land by private purchase. [One of them owns] over half-a-million sheep scattered in flocks all along the coast of the Black Sea."[6] Amidst all this rapid progress and worldly success the role of religion, once the *raison d'être* of the group, almost recedes into the background. It seems that at the moment when a Mennonite utopia, the community of the saints and saved, lay within reach of realization, it became secularized and void of its spiritual

[6] C. B. Schmidt, Commissioner of Immigration, Rock Island Lines, *Reminiscences of Kansas Immigration Work.* (Privately printed).

content, a commonwealth of ordinary people with the ambitions and motivations of sinners and the fallen nature of man. Religious convictions and interests now were one aspect of everyday life, perhaps still a central but by no means the only aspect. Many concessions had to be made to other conflicting interests which frequently dominated and determined action. Religion, at one time a spiritual power permeating all personal hopes and desires, was institutionalized, and religious institutions were but one factor among many other institutions, often more in the foreground of attention. Perhaps the transition from religious movement to institutionalized sect was completed as early as in the West Prussian local communities.[7] Yet the evidence for the Russian period is fuller and brings out more clearly the real role played by religion and church in the social life of the group.[8]

As a sect, the Mennonites were organized into congregations, that is, voluntary associations of believers in a given locality or region. The test of admission consisted in spiritual conversion and high moral conduct. Authority was vested in the *Bruderschaft* (church assembly) presided over by an elder.[9] Elders and other preachers were elected and functioned as teachers of the Gospel and leaders in religious exercises while the deacons took care of works of charity. The *Bruderschaft* watched over the conduct of the members; it could censor them, impose penances, or expel deviants. Mennonites were expected to avoid participation in the affairs of the world, to refuse public offices, and to refrain from any use of force or violence. Intermarriage and intimate social intercourse with non-Mennonites, as well as excommunicated Mennonites, were forbidden. The unbaptized children of members were to

[7] This is indicated by the references to old village by-laws (called *Dorf-Willkür*) found in H. Wiebe, *Das Siedlungswerk niederländischer Mennoniten im Weichseltal zwischen Fordon und Weissenberg bis zum Ausgang des 18. Jahrhunderts* (unpublished doctoral dissertation in the Goshen College Library), and E. Händiges, "Beiträge zur Geschichte der Mennonitengemeinde Elbing-Ellerwald . . ." in: *Festgabe für D. Christian Neff* (Weierhof, 1938), pp. 25-43. The available evidence, however, is largely circumstantial and inferential and thus insufficient for strictly sociological analysis.

[8] The following interpretation is in substantial agreement with that by Robert Kreider ("The Anabaptist Conception of the Church in the Russian Mennonite Environment, 1798-1870," *MQR*, Vol. XXV, No. 1, pp. 17-46) who quite independently has reached the same conclusions as this author. Kreider proposes to substitute for "sect" the term "brotherhood" which indeed would be theologically more correct: We have retained the traditional term since it has been widely adopted in sociological literature. (See, e.g., S. D. Clark, *Church and Sect in Canada*, Toronto, 1948.) Readers interested in a more detailed, yet sufficiently brief, account of the social conditions in the Mennonite Settlements in Southern Russia should consult Kreider's article which is the most accurate statement so far readily available in English.

[9] The conventional English translation of the German designation "Ältester" with "bishop" is somewhat misleading since it suggests an episcopal church organization.

be educated in the faith and treated as novices of a kind. Up to this point, the organization of the sect followed familiar lines. It claimed only a segment of the total personality; its purpose was limited to clearly religious objectives. In addition to being a Mennonite, a member of the sect continued to be part of his local community and of the people into which he was born. Thus the sect presupposes the existence of a larger society from whose midst its members are recruited, into which they remain integrated to a large extent, and whose economic, political, and in part social benefits they enjoy. In addition, the sect as a protest movement against the secularization of social life and institutions, actually presupposes also the existence of an established church; for it is the protest against institutionalized religion which not only gives rise to the sect but gives meaning to its continued existence.

In Russia, however, the Mennonites, defined as such by their membership in the sect, were treated not simply as a voluntary association for the satisfaction of distinctive religious interests. Locally and within their colonies, they constituted the whole of society, not just a section of it. The law recognized them as a corporate body charged with the satisfaction of all, or almost all, human needs of its members. The individual rights of Mennonites, particularly important property rights, were derived from the corporate rights of the group, membership in which was acquired by birth. Although aided in the beginning by the institutions of the larger society, primarily its economy and government, the Mennonites were expected to organize themselves as a self-sufficient, self-regulating, and self-perpetuating social system. Because they were foreigners and heretics they remained sealed off from the rest of the Orthodox and Russian population. Outside contacts were kept at a minimum, above all because of the difference of language. Their prosperity depended primarily on what they were able to achieve with the natural resources put at their exclusive disposal and the opportunities supplied by the economic system of the Russian Empire. The manner in which they would shape their whole way of life, exercise controls, and make social institutions work, was left to their own ingenuity within the rather broad and liberal framework provided by the Colonial Law. If they were not yet a people when they arrived, they were forced into becoming one by the conditions of their settlement.

The novel situation required a redefinition of the relationship between religious and nonreligious interests and institutions. The

traditional distinction was made between a sacred (Mennonite) and a secular (non-Mennonite) sphere of life and of social interaction. Now, however, the Mennonite social system viewed as a sect, on the one hand, and the system viewed as a people, as society itself, on the other, became coextensive as to territory and essentially also as to personnel. Yet, a complete identification of both, which could have been achieved through the institution of a theocracy, for instance, was precluded by the Anabaptist teaching on the separation of church and state, brotherhood (sect) and society. Accordingly, the autonomous structure of the old sectarian congregation was retained. Parallel to it, a new secular society was organized with its own autonomous institutions; that is to say, theoretically at least the Mennonite colony and village community with their local assemblies and elected officers, were kept apart from the Mennonite (church) congregation with its own assembly and functionaries. This subtle division of powers and spheres of influence created new problems and inner contradictions.

Above all, the traditional opposition against participation in worldly affairs became an anachronism; for the "world," at least the immediate little world of the colony, was now a Mennonite world. Nor was there an established church to be protested against in the name of the rigorous spirituality of the sect. Religious freedom did not mean that every individual was free to worship in his own way; it meant the corporate freedom of Mennonites to practice their particular religion according to their own traditions and understanding. Moreover, membership in the secular Mennonite system was defined by membership in the religious congregation. A rapprochement and mutual interpenetration of both systems was thus inevitable, changing the sectarian character of the latter and forcing it into the position of an established territorial or parish church. When faced with the necessity of maintaining peace and order in their own colonies, internal sanctions and the less drastic external sanctions provided by the church assembly proved insufficient. Excommunication as last resort, however, had serious legal implications, for only a Mennonite in good standing and his family could hold land or enjoy the legal privileges extended to the group. Loss of membership in the church meant also loss of civil status amounting in some instances to expulsion from the colony. Because of the socially disruptive consequences of excommunication, often pronounced for petty infractions of church discipline, the practice had actually to be curbed by the Russian authorities. Instead, the Men-

nonite officer of civil administration was compelled to exercise police power and coercion by force, including corporal punishment, quite contrary to the principles of his religion.

The identification of membership in a parish church and membership in a village and colony also suggested the regional unification of local congregations in conferences of elders and preachers and the establishment of the Kirchen Konvent in 1851. The position of the church officials was thereby greatly strengthened, at times leading to abuse of their spiritual influence for personal ambitions or making religion a means to worldly ends. Particularly in the New Colony, the ministers seem to have sided consistently with the party of proprietors against the growing landless classes. Since the preachers were usually elected from the ranks of wealthy farmers, who wielded influence also in local government, the officially recognized Mennonite church became identified with secular interests and power.

As the religious congregations and preacher conferences, though formally still separate, tended to co-operate ever more closely with the secular administration (at times using the secular power to further religious unity and interests, at times being themselves used to strengthen and support government or economic interests), the old religious forces in the Mennonite heritage were once more set free. Protest movements, essentially sectarian in character, made their appearance, particularly among the lower classes, which claimed that Mennonite principles had been violated by the fusion of religious with nonreligious institutions even if both were in the hands of Mennonites. This led to the formation of independent congregations, or brotherhoods, of dissenters intent upon restoring the old spirit and religious fervor by withdrawing from their worldly brethren. Although freedom of religious association was entirely in line with Anabaptist and Mennonite traditions, the leaders of the official church did not hesitate to invoke the arm of the secular power and to threaten their opponents with economic ruin in order to enforce religious unity and bring schismatics back into the fold. In some instances, it was actually the Russian authorities who upheld the civil rights of dissenters and religious freedom against the established church in the Mennonite communities. The Russian period of Mennonite history thus brings clearly to the fore

(Continued on page 200)

[10] This is clearly realized by many Mennonite theologians and scholars. See particularly Robert Kreider, *loc. cit.*, also the very thoughtful statement by Guy F. Hershberger, *Nonresistance and the State: the Pennsylvania Quaker Experiment in Politics,* 1682-1756 (Scottdale, Pa., 1936).

THE MENNONITE CHURCH IN WORLD WAR II
A REVIEW AND EVALUATION

MELVIN GINGERICH

The lessons of World War I were not forgotten by the postwar leaders of the Mennonite Church.[1] With the enlargement of the Peace Problems Committee in 1925, an aggressive program of peace teaching was launched. Its threefold program called for (1) a plan of education on nonresistance within the church, (2) for keeping in touch with government officials, and (3) for witnessing to the nonresistant faith among other groups.

The chief method of teaching used by the committee was the publishing and distribution of books and pamphlets. In 1927 the committee published two books by John Horsch.[2] These were followed by booklets written by Wilbur Bender and G. F. Hershberger.[3] In addition, the *Gospel Herald* carried Edward Yoder's quarterly peace section beginning with 1933. Other church periodicals such as the *Youth's Christian Companion* also featured articles on the peace principles of the church.

In the 1937 session of the General Conference the committee's *Statement on Peace, War, and Military Service* was adopted. This *Statement* was not only widely circulated in our own branch of the church but it also became a very influential document in the other branches of the church, several adopting it verbatim and others modifying it slightly.

During the period between the two wars, a number of study conferences on nonresistance were held which exerted a wide influence in the church. The conference in Goshen, Indiana, in 1935 was especially important because it clarified thinking on the compromising nature of noncombatant service and pointed the way toward alternative service.[4]

[1] An address delivered to the Chicago joint study conference, March 18-20, 1949, sponsored by the Peace Problems Committee and the Industrial Relations Committee of the Mennonite Church, sometimes called the "Old" Mennonite Church, to which the observations of this article are restricted.

[2] These two books by Horsch were *The Principle of Nonresistance as Held by the Mennonite Church. A Historical Survey* (Scottdale, 1927. Pp. 60) and *Symposium on War* (Scottdale, 1927. Pp. 44).

[3] The book by Wilbur Bender is entitled *Nonresistance in Colonial Pennsylvania* (Scottdale, 1936. Pp. 31), Hershberger's two booklets were *Nonresistance and the State —The Pennsylvania Quaker Experiment in Politics 1682-1756* (Scottdale, 1936. Pp. 48) and *Can Christians Fight? Essays on War and Peace* (Scottdale, 1940. Pp. 180).

[4] The papers read at this conference were mimeographed. A collection of the papers are on file in the Goshen College Mennonite Historical Library. The paper on noncombatant service, by G. F. Hershberger, appeared in the January, 1935, *Mennonite Quarterly Review* under the title, "Is Alternate Service Desirable and Possible?"

What was the actual result of this peace teaching upon the church? Certainly this was a much more aggressive program of indoctrination than the ones that preceded the previous wars in which the United States was involved. Unfortunately, we do not have reliable figures which we can use to compare the way our young men responded in previous wars with their response in World War II. The Mennonite Research Foundation is, however, working on the statistics for World War I so that it will soon be possible to make comparisons.[5] If there was, therefore, more widespread peace teaching prior to World War II than at any previous comparable time in American Mennonite history, why did almost 40 per cent of our men go into the army? Doubtless, there were congregations in which this literature was not widely distributed and in which the ministers seldom, if ever, preached sermons on nonresistance. A few young men from our churches have told me that they do not recall hearing any teaching on this subject previous to America's entry into World War II. This was perhaps the reason why a part of the 40 per cent of our drafted men who went into the army did so.

Why did the rest of the 40 per cent accept military service? Social pressures and economic advantages ranked high as reasons for them entering military service. Gone was the day of cultural isolation and the economic independence of our people. Whether they were in the factory, the office, or on the farm, they recognized that their economic security and even social standing would be threatened if they opposed public opinion on the war question. Many did not have the deep seated convictions and the moral courage necessary to stand against public opinion and so service in the army was their response to these pressures. But whatever the environmental factors influencing these young men may have been, the church must still assume a large burden of blame for not effectively indoctrinating them. The question may well be asked too if many of our churches were not too timid during the war itself, discontinuing to a large extent their positive teaching against participation in war. A large number of the men who served in the military forces are now back in their home communities. One of the most challenging opportunities facing the church is the winning of these men to a wholehearted acceptance of New Testament nonresistance.[6]

[5] The Mennonite Research Foundation is completing a list of all Mennonite men in the United States who were conscientious objectors in World War I. Experience records of a large number of these men have also been gathered by the Research Foundation.

[6] The number and the status of these men is reported by the Peace Problems Committee in the *Twenty-sixth Mennonite General Conference* report (1949), p. 63.

The church, therefore, should not only continue to sponsor peace literature but the Peace Problems Committee should give considerable thought to the problem of the most effective use of this material. Perhaps the churches should be encouraged to organize study groups, as is being done in the Franconia Conference, in which a number of evenings are devoted to the study of an outline on Biblical nonresistance, supplemented by these publications of the Peace Problems Committee. The success of the peace teams shows that our churches are eager to have this message emphasized.

Other methods of teaching must be tried so that this issue is brought clearly before the consciences of all our people. At a time in the world's history when nearly all peoples are tired of wars and when they fear war as they have perhaps never done before, the great nations are spending more money on armaments than ever before in peacetime. We are entering a period of militarization such as the world has never before witnessed and consequently our peace teaching will be tested as it never has been before. One of the major lessons we can learn, therefore, from our experiences during the last twenty years is that we must keep the Peace Problems Committee under the control of men of initiative, resourcefulness, vision, and consecration. Its position is strategic. Given the right kind of dynamic leadership in this committee, the church will very likely maintain an effective witness, but if the committee should become sluggish, the church could as a result slowly lose its convictions, as it has done in other countries and in other times. The work of the committee, however, must be supplemented by that of district conference committees and concerned leaders in every section of the church.

Another observation on the work of the Peace Problems Committee should be noted at this point. The committee kept informed on the trend of world affairs and assessed quite accurately the threat of the growing world tensions during the decade of the thirties. A reading of their minutes and correspondence reveals that they took a position far more realistic than that of those pacifist groups who placed great confidence in the League of Nations and the Paris Pact. Having learned from the World War I experience how unsatisfactory it was to try to solve the problem of the drafting of conscientious objectors after the drafting had started, they wisely attempted to solve the problem in advance of the passage of the law and the first drafting of conscientious objectors. It is significant that the national government concurred in the wisdom of this approach. The Director of Selective Service, Dr. Clarence A. Dyk-

stra, in his memorandum to the President on December 20, 1940, said, "During the World War conscientious objectors presented difficulties to both the armed forces and the law enforcement agencies far out of proportion to the numbers involved. To avoid so far as possible a recurrence of such difficulties, a temporary and experimental solution along the following lines is believed desirable."[7]

Colonel Lewis B, Hershey in October, 1940, also expressed this point of view when in talking about the position of the historic peace churches he declared, "You fellows want to make up your minds as to what you want to do and how it ought to be done and then we are in a position to talk intelligently about it."[8] If our experiences during World War II were more satisfactory than during World War I, and I believe they were, the explanation can be found in part in our positive approach to the government in advance of the time when these problems were upon us. There are those who believe sincerely that it is a mistake for nonresistant people ever to petition the government but that we should allow the Congress to pass whatever laws they choose. After that we should either obey these laws without protest, or if our conscience forbids that, we should refuse to obey and suffer the consequences. The argument is that any kind of approach to the government exerts a kind of pressure not in keeping with our nonresistant position and our concept of the separation of church and state. In addition, they remind us that we have no illustrations of Jesus and the apostles ever petitioning the government for favorable laws.

Several points can be raised against the above position. Petitioning the government may or may not be pressure politics. If the petition carries any threat of reprisal, it is not in keeping with the spirit of nonresistance. We must bear in mind, however, that we are living under a representative government and not under a dictatorship as the Apostolic Church did. Petitions in that day were not welcomed and, coming from the Christian leaders, would have been, very likely, not only utterly futile but would also in addition have provoked severe resentment in the government officials. In a government such as ours the lawmakers and executives desire to know the wishes of the people. They spend many hours

[7] See Appendix 9, pp. 442-3, in Melvin Gingerich's *Service for Peace. A History of Mennonite Civilian Public Service* (Akron, Pa.: The Mennonite Central Committee, 1949).

[8] *The Origins of Civilian Public Service* (National Service Board for Religious Objectors, Washington, D.C.), Document II of Paul Comly French's "Memorandum of Conversation with Colonel Hershey."

each week reading their letters and their local papers. The great majority are truly concerned that as much as possible the laws of the land represent the will of the people and that they safeguard the civil rights and religious liberties of the minority groups in the nation. When these men are approached in the proper spirit, they welcome the expression of concern held by the minority groups. It would be a disservice to them not to keep them informed of our convictions and our thinking.

In a certain sense the command given us to pray for our government implies that we give this kind of witness. For what shall we pray? That our lawmakers may have wisdom? Does not such a prayer imply that we must do our part to put such necessary facts in their possession that will enable them to see as many as possible of the different aspects of the problem so that they may have the background of information for arriving at wise decisions? We also have a responsibility to witness to all men concerning the truths we believe are eternal and to warn all men of the dangers that lie in courses of action not in harmony with the truth as revealed in Jesus Christ. Our responsibility cannot be so construed as to pass by the men in government.

It therefore seems clear to the writer that in evaluating our experiences during World War II, we must approve the work of the Peace Problems Committee in appearing before government committees and lawmakers and that we must encourage the committee to continue this kind of witnessing, sending as our respresentatives those men who are not only best informed concerning the history and convictions of the church but who also have a broad understanding of national and international problems.

This leads into the area of church and government cooperation. Here many problems present themselves and we may not yet be able to see clearly the implications of what happened during World War II. This paper will open the problem and draw a few tentative conclusions. Under the original plan of C.P.S., in general the government was responsible for the men during the working hours, and the church agencies in the persons of the camp staff were responsible for the men during their off-work hours. But as time went on, "the peace churches had to relapse more and more into the role of reluctant but acquiescent agents," quoting Sibley and Jacob in their recent *Conscientious Objectors in World War* II.[9] Selective Service "stiffened this disciplinary fiber by a

[9] *Conscientious Objectors in World War II.* (Ithaca, New York: The Pacifist Research Bureau, 1949.)

variety of 'punitive powers' which the camp director was to administer: admonition, reprimand, suspension of 'privileges,' assignment of extra work (2 eight-hour days for one offense), reduced 'rank,' forfeiture of one half of a man's cash allowance, cancellation of twenty days' furlough a year, imposition of additional service up to forty days a year," again quoting from Sibley and Jacob.[10]

There can be no doubt about it but that our camp directors became agents of the government enforcing Selective Service regulations upon the men under their control. In the early days of C.P.S. when the men were motivated by the second-mile philosophy and S.S. rules did not seem arbitrary, the camp directors had comparatively little difficulty in filling their dual capacities. As Selective Service, however, became more impersonal in its dealings with the men and as the newer regulations seemed to the men to be increasingly arbitrary, resentment against the system increased, violations of the rules became more common, and the camp directors found themselves becoming increasingly the "policemen" of Selective Service or the "mayors" of these C.P.S. villages. From the early months of C.P.S. there were those outside the Mennonite Church who saw great dangers in this trend. For the church to become an agency of a secular government in the enforcement of conscription was to them a great sin. Spokesmen such as Bishop Oxnam of the Methodist Church cried out against this unholy alliance, as he and others considered it to be. Let the government administer its own camps was his plea; the churches should stop being agents of the government in the enforcement of conscription. Finally several groups withdrew from the National Service Board of Religious Objectors because they could no longer be parties to the system. Gradually some of our own young men acting as camp directors began to agree with this point of view, partly as a result of the influence of the critics of the system but just as much because of their experiences in trying to be agents of the churches and Selective Service at the same time. A considerable number of these young men have testified that their consciences would never again permit them to serve in this dual capacity.

Were these young men right in their position? Is there any difference in principle between serving as "mayor" of a C.P.S. camp and mayor of a city, except that when a man served the Selective Service System as the officer in a C.P.S. camp he represented the church and thus the church and the state were allied while when

[10] *Ibid.*

our members served as mayors of their towns they did so as individuals and not as representatives of the church? Have we honestly weighed the criticism of our position advanced by *The Christian Century* and other groups? Or may it be that a chain of circumstances forced the Mennonite Church into a place where it became the chief defender of a position others considered to be a great evil? May it be that the men who helped organize the system not foreseeing the implications that later developed were slowly driven into a position where it was extremely difficult for them to reverse themselves and where they could no longer see the entire picture as clearly as did those who looked on from a greater distance? Or is the whole problem just a relative one with the evil of the church acting as the agent of the government appearing only after a certain point has been passed? Is it not true that our public school teachers, our rural mail carriers, the minister who performs marriages under the laws of the state, and many others are also agents of the state helping enforce its laws?

There are those who believe that we should not again accept a similar plan for the administration of the camps. Either government camps such as Canada had or much more preferably camps in which we may make our own rules and regulations and use our own methods of dealing with violators would be more desirable than what we had during C.P.S., they believe, although admittedly either of these two alternatives presents its problems also. This is not to deny that C.P.S. was a great improvement over what we had in World War I nor is it to find fault with the leaders of the N.S.B.R.O. and the M.C.C. It is merely to open one of the most serious questions which may well face us if C.O.'s are drafted once more. We give great credit to the men on the Military Problems Committee during World War I and yet our experience during those years proved that we needed a more satisfactory solution to the problem of the drafted C.O. than they had advanced in their day. So perhaps now we once more need pioneer planning and a new approach, if such is possible. And here it should be added again that the plan the churches were given was not what they had originally asked for and what the M.C.C. now favors is not what we had during World War II. It is only fair to say that both committees accepted what seemed obtainable, recognizing in both instances that the plan was not ideal.

The Mennonite Church has not or does not now take what is known as the absolutist position opposing registration and conscription. In only a perfect society could there be organization

that would function smoothly without the use of penalties and the power of coercion. To oppose this prerogative of government is to propose the substitution of anarchy for the proper form of society organization. We do not oppose the laws that conscript us to destroy the obnoxious weeds along the highway or that conscript us to remove the snow from our sidewalks. As long as the service for which we are conscripted is not wrong in itself but is socially useful, we submit. When the government conscripts us to conserve soil or build dams, we, therefore, cannot deny it this claim to our service.

Since through the laws providing for this kind of useful service a demand is made that we register, we co-operate with the law at that point. If there would be no provision in the law for conscientious objectors and if registration would be the first step leading toward inevitable military service, then we should perhaps refuse to register. To be consistent in nonregistration now, however, would require that we also refuse to give information to the assessor or pay taxes, knowing that part of the objective of these procedures is to raise money for military purposes. We should not, however, ridicule those who have tender consciences on these points and we must continue to pray for humility and enlightenment.

One final word on our relations with the government should be mentioned. Our standing in Washington was high and our men were highly respected. Considering the complexities of the problem facing our government leaders, it is great tribute to their tolerance and fairness that many of them took precious time to listen to us and to try to develop a workable system that provided for genuine religious liberty. These men command our respect and deserve our thanks. Having spoken on a number of occasions during the past two years to high officials in Selective Service, the Department of Agriculture, and the Bureau of Prisons, I have been impressed with their sincere praise of the Mennonites, the Mennonite camps, and the M.C.C. leaders. There has been built for us a reservoir of good will that for years to come may well nourish good relations in Washington.

An equally important question for evaluation in the review of our World War II experience must be, "What was the impact of C.P.S. upon the young men who went to camp?" The church accepted the great financial and administrative responsibilities of C.P.S. for one primary reason, and that was to obtain the opportunity to guide the intellectual and spiritual development of our young men during their crucial years under conscription. How well was this purpose accomplished?

It may be too early to measure how effectively the above purpose was accomplished. The men, however, have attempted to evaluate their own experiences.[11] In a sampling of opinion of 286 men from our branch of the church 56 per cent believed that the importance of personal devotions had increased in their lives as a result of C.P.S., 35 per cent believed it had remained the same, and 19 per cent admitted it had decreased. Thirty-five per cent of our men believed that as a result of C.P.S. they held to the doctrine of nonconformity more strongly than before, 44 per cent about the same, and 14 per cent less strongly. On the question of loyalty to the home church, 36 per cent believed themselves to be more loyal, 55 per cent about the same, and 7 per cent less loyal. Answering the question as to whether through their C.P.S. experience they had gained some understanding of the Christian life that the home church needs 77 per cent of our men answered in the affirmative and only 8 per cent in the negative. Two thirds of our men testified that their appreciation of their Mennonite heritage had been increased by their C.P.S. experience, while 29 per cent felt it had remained about the same. For 78 per cent of our men their understanding of the doctrine of nonresistance became more clear in C.P.S., for 18 per cent it remained about the same, while 3 per cent admitted they became more confused on its meaning.

These statistics, on the whole, present a favorable picture of the positive contribution of C.P.S. to the spiritual lives of our young men. When one remembers that many of these young men who were immature, who had not yet thought clearly through their own convictions, who had lived in sheltered communities under the watchful eyes of their parents and churches, and who had scarcely ever heard any convictions expressed sincerely and conscientiously except the traditional Mennonite concepts, were suddenly uprooted and transplanted into a non-Mennonite community hundreds of miles from their homes and friends where they met men from the corners of the nation who had strange customs and ways of thinking and where they did not have the constant guidance of parental thinking, it is not surprising that a small minority became confused, lost part of its church loyalty, thought they had made no gains in their Christian lives, and admitted that their devotional habits had suffered. It is to the credit of our churches, however, that the over-

11 See *Mennonite Quarterly Review* for Paul Albrecht's article on "Civilian Public Service Evaluated by Civilian Public Service Men" for a description of the way in which the questionnaire was administered and what it revealed. See also Gingerich's *Service for Peace,* Appendix 23, pp. 478-88 for a more complete tabulation of the results of the study.

whelming majority were able to rise above the handicaps of C.P.S. and to make effective use of the spiritual challenges of the situation.

If there are to be camps again, what can be done so that this minority will also profit by the experience? Improvements can of course be made in the spiritual guidance given to the young men in camp. But just as important is the work that must be done with the men in the home church before they go to camp. They must be helped to see beyond church rules into the principles that lie back of them so that when they face new issues for which they do not have ready-made church rules, they may be able to apply the basic principles and draw up their own code of Christian behavior.

Were enough contacts made with the men in camp and was the program of shepherding the young men adequate? In the opinion of most camp leaders the answer to these questions must be negative. One of our C.P.S. men points out that at no time in the history of our church were so large a number of members left so long without regular pastors. The pastoral visitation program was inadequate. Too often, not so much perhaps in our branch of the church, the question of geographic convenience determined who was sent to preach and too seldom were the men chosen who best understood the young men and their situation. Too often the men stayed at the camp only a part of a day and so were unable to learn the problems of the camp and to discuss them intelligently with the men. These experiences were in part responsible for our men feeling that the churches back home did not understand them. According to the questionnaire only 45 per cent thought their home congregations understood their camp experiences. Fifty per cent thought their home churches did not understand their problems.

If there is one point concerning which most of the camp directors are agreed it is that in any future camp program there must be a full-time pastor for each large camp. Would it not seem reasonable that a group of 150 young men need a full-time pastor more acutely than a well-established congregation of that size?

Reference was made to our young men becoming acquainted with men of different localities and backgrounds. The clash of customs and ideas in some instances did not produce wholesome results, but it is perhaps safe to say that in most instances the results were beneficial. Eighty-one per cent of our men in C.P.S. thought it was valuable to have ministers from other denominations visit our camps.[12] Only three per cent thought this was harmful. Only

[12] See *Service for Peace,* Appendix 23.

7 per cent of our men thought they held less strongly to the doctrines of our church because of having lived with men of different denominations and of different Mennonite branches. Forty-two per cent felt this experience had strengethened their loyalty to their own church doctrines and 46 per cent believed that it had made no difference either way. Seventy per cent of the men from our branch tested in the questionnaire believed that beneficial results came from having all Mennonite groups together in the camps, while only 11 per cent felt this was harmful. Fifty-three per cent felt that it had been beneficial to have non-Mennonite men in our camps, while 17 per cent thought it was unwise. This negative reaction was very likely the result of the many unpleasant experiences with the Jehovah's Witnesses, the Molokans, and a few political objectors. After government camps were opened and the M.C.C. camps accepted only those non-Mennonite men who agreed to co-operate with Mennonite principles, this situation adjusted itself fairly successfully. In any future program, there should be a safeguard to prevent men being placed in camps for which we are responsible who are not in sympathy with our basic position.

One of the most far-reaching results of C.P.S. was the building of friendships across denominational and division lines. Many of our men have testified that before they went to C.P.S. they were only dimly aware that there were any Mennonites besides those of our branch and the Amish. Those of Russian Mennonite backgrounds also had similar restricted ideas of the number and kinds of Mennonites in this nation. Such names as Hillsboro, Inman, Reedley, Mountain Lake, Corn, Freeman, E.M.B., K.M.B., M.B., and G.C. now have definite meanings to our churches. To the list of common family names such as Hershberger, Hostetler, Horst, Lehman, and Miller have now been added Bartel, Becker, Classen, Dirks, Derksen, and on through the alphabet. The men learned that they had much in common and lasting friendships by the scores resulted. Through correspondence and visitation these contacts are maintained and as a result we may expect more genuine, sympathetic co-operation between the various Mennonite branches than this country has ever before witnessed. Not only the younger men have had this experience but the older leaders of the church working in the M.C.C. have undergone a similar awakening experience. It is the writer's belief that this process is and can continue to be a strengthening factor in the preservation of the best in our Mennonite heritage. We can learn lessons from the other branches of the church, and especially from those of the Russian Mennonite

groups, that will strengthen us, and they may learn and are learning in a similar way from us. One of the most profound influences of the World War II experiences is this growth in understanding and the learning of the fact that there is a great body of faith which Mennonites hold in common and that it is possible for them to cooperate without giving up those special emphases which each group holds dear. Of course, some that is mere tradition and custom has suffered in this process but the young men who lived together as members of a family for three, four, and five years believe the final result has been beneficial.

It is true that some of the other groups had less strict standards than our own, but by and large the best boys from all the Mennonite groups were equally devoted, sincere, and conscientious in their Christian lives and the ones with the lowest standards were very much alike whether they were Amish, General Conference, or "Old" Mennonite. It is also true, we must admit, that at times the lowest standards in the camps were those practiced by some of our own men and some of the Amish. It was always a thrill to attend a prayer meeting in C.P.S. and there hear the sincere prayers of the men from a half-dozen branches of Mennonites as well as those from other denominations.

That this mingling of the men has not been harmful is evidenced by our postwar experience. Our young men have returned to their home churches and have adjusted themselves remarkably well. There is no indication that they have rebelled against the standards of the church, but on the whole they have sincerely tried to raise the standards. There were those who feared that through this fellowship friendships would be formed which would lead to intermarriage, with the resultant transfer of our members into the other branches of the church. It is true that there has been intermarriage but quite probably as many have come into our branch of the church through this process as have left our branch.

Through all of these experiences we have learned the art of self-criticism as individuals and as groups. Especially helpful have been the evaluations of the sincere deeply religious young men of other faiths who lived in our Mennonite C.P.S. family for periods of years. As a result of their sympathetic but pointed evaluations much of the smugness that too often has characterized our Mennonite communities has been dissipated in our C.P.S. men and in general they have become men of greater humility than they were before this experience.

But what happened in the home churches as a result of the war? We learned many new lessons. For example, when our young men of from 18 to 25 were selected for positions of responsibility in C.P.S. leadership we became more acutely aware of the rich resources in Mennonite youth than we ever had been before. Here were these young men facing new problems that might well have baffled fifty-year-old ministers who had always had the counsel of strong congregations in times of testing. Yet these men accepted their responsibilities and made decisions of great importance. Can it be that this has been a factor making it possible to launch a Mennonite Youth Fellowship organization and Service Units with scarcely any opposition when such movements would almost surely have been doomed to failure twenty years ago?

There can be no doubt that the C.P.S. experience made us more fully aware of the service aspect of Christian living. Here were young men, several thousand of them, who actually were giving three, four, or five years of free service for the sake of maintaining a Christian principle. How shallow in comparison seemed our small sacrifices and our $25 gift per member for the six-year program of C.P.S.! But even this $25 gift plus other donations, including that for relief, was a great gain over the limited sacrifices we had been making previously. Now we have come to the place where we actually encourage our sons and daughters to give a summer or a year or two of free service to the church even if this means that they must turn down $150 a month jobs. This is progress, and the experience of the war years, if it did not create the movement, certainly accelerated it.

Although the gifts per member for the support of C.P.S. do not seem impressive, it is true as was stated above that the total gifts during the war years far exceeded the donations of any previous period in our history. From a low figure of approximately $100,000 in 1933 the gifts received by the Mennonite Board of Missions and Charities tripled by 1942, reaching $300,000. In the next three years, they again tripled, reaching approximately $900,000, but since that time there has been a sharp decline in spite of the fact that national and farm income has continued to increase. What are we to conclude from this? May it be the case that much of the wartime giving was mere pressure giving because we would have been ashamed to do less in the light of the sacrifices our non-Mennonite neighbors were making? A major problem confronting the church is how this same rate of giving may be continued and even increased during peacetime.

We have also changed our concept of what Christian service is. Before the war, the spirit of secularism and a false theology together had made their influence felt in our midst. Too much we thought of Christianity as finding its chief expression in Sunday worship. We divided life into sacred and secular aspects and thought of certain callings as sacred and others as secular. It would have been difficult to treat certain problems of life in our church papers because the readers would have insisted that a Christian church paper has no business to meddle into secular affairs. If the article would have dealt with a social or economic problem, the writer very likely would have been suspected of being tainted with the social gospel.

In C.P.S., however, our men engaged in soil conservation. Was this or was it not Christian service? Slowly we began to recognize that to conserve God's gifts which He has provided for the use of His children was not secular at all but was truly Christian service. And to build dams which would store water for His children to drink and to irrigate their fields was Christian service. To make the desert bloom was also serving our fellow men and God. And as we gave this kind of service, the spirit of evangelism and missions was not minimized. In fact, there are indications that we are entering the greatest period of missionary interest the church has ever experienced.

As we searched for new areas in which to express this concern for wider fields of Christian service, we entered the mental hospitals, where we were shocked to learn how great had been our neglect of the unfortunate victims of mental disease in our midst. Our sympathies and our consciences were quickened to the extent that several thousand of our young men and scores of our young women gave terms of Christian service in this field. Furthermore, we are now building Mennonite institutions to meet this need. We cannot forget what we have seen and so we continue a service that ten years ago only a few of our number had recognized as a legitimate Christian concern.

We were also led into the Deep South and into Puerto Rico where there were unmeasured opportunities to serve underprivileged and forgotten humanity. Here we learned the same lesson that our India missionaries had been telling us for years. We can minister most effectively to our fellow men as we take into account their total needs—physical, intellectual, social, economic, and spiritual. Christianity has a message in all of these areas and Christ must be sovereign of all aspects of one's life or else He is not King at all.

In the Christian community there can't be any purely secular interests. Man's personality must be a unit, and, therefore, it is Christian service to help him physically, socially, and economically, provided it is done in the name and spirit of Christ, just as much as it is to minister to his spiritual needs. These lessons have helped make it possible to launch our Service Unit program, to hold successful industrial relations conferences, and to have a *Mennonite Community* magazine.[13]

Without becoming victims of the earlier social gospel approach, our consciences have been sensitized to large areas of human need concerning which we formerly were comparatively ignorant. We have recaptured some of the Anabaptist vision that had so successfully in an earlier day related the Gospel to the whole of life.

Another lesson from the past war is the need for and value of careful scholarly investigation and study in the work of the church. Before new fields of service were entered, there had to be thorough investigation and study. The approach to Washington officials had to be preceded by careful study and preparation. The development of the C.P.S. program had to be in the hands of men who were trained. The instructions for C.P.S. men, the study booklets, the peace literature, all had to be prepared by the specially trained men in our midst. The manpower survey requested by the government had to be planned and executed by someone who understood statistics. The masterful study of the M.C.C. Draft Status Census had to be planned and directed by a scholar.[14] Illustrations such as these could be multiplied. They measure the growing importance of the school-trained men in the work of the Mennonite Church. World War II accelerated this trend.[15]

The war also revealed weaknesses. Not only did 40 per cent of our drafted men accept military service[16] but among those who took the IV-E position were a number who were unable to explain convincingly the reason for their stand. Too often they were un-

[13] The *Mennonite Community* is published by the Mennonite Publishing House, Scottdale, Pa. Its editor since its founding in January, 1947, has been Grant Stoltzfus and its business manager Ralph Hernley, both young men who served several years each in C.P.S.

[14] The draft census by Howard Charles appeared in the *Proceedings of the Fourth Annual Conference on Mennonite Cultural Problems* (North Newton, Kansas: Bethel College Press, 1945). Pp. 82-106.

[15] In 1947 the Mennonite Research Foundation, working under the Mennonite Board of Education ("Old" Mennonite), was established at Goshen College. The two men working in this service agency both hold Ph.D.'s in history.

[16] For the final revised figures on the number of Mennonite young men from each branch of the church entering military service, see *Twenty-sixth Mennonite General Conference,* pp. 62-65.

able to see the application of the principle in their daily contacts with their fellow campers, the government men, and their neighbors. Some of them, as the statistics quoted above indicate, were unable to maintain the high level of spiritual living one would expect from a Christian conscientious objector. They allowed their period of service to become one of galling servitude and developed attitudes of bitterness. Away from the sheltering influences of home those who had conformed to the patterns of the local church because of social and family pressure and not because of deep-seated convictions, when away from these restraints followed the paths of least resistance which when undesirable associates were chosen often led to the acceptance of bad habits. These few were always the objects of deep concern by our camp staffs and the consecrated majority in each of our camps.

During World War II the witness of the C.O.'s in camp was in general, however, more clear-cut than that of a large per cent of the membership remaining at home. The same could be said of World War I when almost the entire membership in many of our communities bought Liberty Bonds and thus helped directly in the financing of the war. In World War II, however, an attempt was made to avoid this compromise of the nonresistant principle by offering a plan to the members of the church which made it possible to buy regular civilian bonds instead of war bonds. There was a liberal response to this offer and the church thus gave a witness to its inability to participate directly in the financing of the war.[17] Some felt, however, that through this plan other money was released for war purposes and thus indirectly even this was aiding the war effort. Much better, they believed, was the plan of donating liberal sums for the relief of war victims. It should be pointed out, however, that at no time did the M.C.C. or the church directly encourage its people to buy these civilian bonds. It merely urged that those who felt obligated to buy bonds should choose the civilian instead of the war bonds. The entire area of war financing and war taxes merits our careful study.

In spite of the provision for the purchase of civilian bonds, in some areas of the church war bonds were purchased by our members and in other areas children participated in the public school scrap drives as well as in the war stamp campaigns. Public school teachers faced a special test as these various war programs were often sponsored through the schools. In some instances our teachers be-

[17] For a discussion of civilian bonds see Gingerich's *Service for Peace*, pp. 355-59.

came reluctant participants in campaigns and drives they would not have chosen to support. There are, however, excellent illustrations of Mennonites standing for their principles regardless of the cost. There is, for instance, the case of Florence Auernheimer, a General Conference Mennonite, who as a primary teacher in Reedley, California, refused to sell war stamps in her room and consequently lost her job.[18]

By the time of World War II our economic life had become so complex that it was often difficult to draw the line between peacetime and war-supporting work. Some of our Mennonite businessmen early saw the complications that would arise in their plants and consequently changed to the production of goods that were not directly used in the war. Our Peace Problems Committee should study this entire problem so that they can give guidance to our businessmen as the nation once more enters a rearmament program. Many businessmen and farmers managed to go through the war period without ever having committed themselves to the IV-E position. Because of their business and professional attachments some of them would have found it more difficult to take the conscientious objector position than our young men who had not yet become so entangled in the economic affairs of this world. The problem of how those in the home communities may give a more clear witness to their belief in nonresistance must have the best thinking of the church.

The Mennonite Church as a result of her experiences during World War II has undergone changes that would have been difficult to visualize a generation ago. Primarily her vision has been enlarged. It has been enlarged horizontally because she has looked beyond the borders of her own territories more humbly than she has ever done before and has seen there much by which she can profit. Within her own territories there has been a growing appreciation of the problems and the strength of each geographic area of the church. The young men from the Mississippi Valley have learned to know their brethren from the East and from the West and have visited their churches, and many from the East have become acquainted with the churches of Ohio, Indiana, Iowa, Colorado, and other states. Knowing each other better, they will be able to work together more understandingly than before. Our horizontal vision was broadened too as we turned our eyes to Puerto Rico, the Philippines, Europe, Asia, and Africa. Our interests have been ex-

[18] Related personally to the author by Miss Auernheimer.

tended to every continent and to the peoples of all races. As an illustration of the lasting nature of this outreach, the missions in Puerto Rico can be cited.

Our vision has also been enlarged vertically. It has become deeper as we have sensed our own weaknesses and shortcomings more acutely than we saw them earlier. We recognize more clearly than we ever have before that the Gospel is for the whole of life. We recognize more clearly than we have for many generations what true sacrifice entails. And we see more clearly the depth of sin in the world, the exceeding sinfulness of war, and great areas of human need which we had formerly passed by.

MENNONITE COMMONWEALTH IN RUSSIA

(Continued from page 182)

the dilemma and utopian character of a sect. It must either suffer pagans and sinners to run the world, thereby preserving the purity of its ideals without putting them to the test, or it must, like Dostoyevski's Grand Inquisitor, accommodate itself to the stark realities of life in this world, thereby losing its original character.[10] In the period between 1790 and 1870, the Mennonite sectarians in Russia had become a people whose conspicuous secular successes were bought at the price of institutionalization of religion and secularization of the inner life of the group.

MICHAEL SATTLER'S TRIAL AND MARTYRDOM IN 1527

GUSTAV BOSSERT, JR.*

Sattler's Pre-Anabaptist Life

Michael Sattler, an outstanding Anabaptist leader and martyr of South Germany, was born at Staufen in the Breisgau near Freiburg, Germany, about 1490. The Hutterian chronicle relates that he was a learned man. He was familiar with the original languages of the Bible; for in his trial he offered to prove his teaching from these languages. But where he was educated is not yet known. His name is not on the matriculation lists of the University of Freiburg; nevertheless it is possible that as a monk in the near-by Benedictine monastery of St. Peter he attended lectures at Freiburg. In the monastery he reached the office of prior, as is reported in the *Bernischen Chronik* 5, 185ff., of Valerius Anshelm, whose wife was a native of Staufen. This also agrees with the mocking question put to Sattler by the soldiers just before his death in Rottenburg in 1527, as to why he did not remain a lord in the monastery, whereupon Sattler replied, "According to the flesh I would be a lord; but it is better so."

The Reformation caused great excitement in the Breisgau; Freiburg seethed. In Kenzingen Jakob Otter preached evangelically, in Neuenburg Otto Brunfels, in Schlatt the venerable dean Peter Spengler. Sattler began to study the Pauline epistles in the monastery, and soon discovered that the way to righteousness before God was not the one required by the old church and the monastic life. The earnest, morally upright monk was seized with horror for the unspiritual life of the priests and monks. He knew the dangers of celibacy. He therefore left the monastery and married a Beguine, whom Anshelm called "a talented, clever little woman." But now he could no longer stay at home, since Ferdinand I of Austria, the ruler of the Breisgau, had ordered the extirpation of

* *Editor's Note:*

Gustav Bossert, Jr., a Lutheran pastor in Württemberg, son of the noted Anabaptist historian, G. Bossert, Sr., prepared the article on Michael Sattler for the *Mennonitisches Lexikon* some years ago, and in encyclopedia style. It is here reproduced as he wrote it, without the usual scholarly documentation, but with the occasional source reference in the body of the text as prepared by Bossert and with the comprehensive bibliography at the end of the article, to which data on year and place of publication have been added by the editors where possible. Translated from the German by Elizabeth Bender.

heresy. He went to Zurich in 1525, and there, under the influence of Reublin, he joined the Swiss Brethren. With Muntprat of Constance and Konrad Winkler of Wasserburg he worked with zeal, holding meetings in forests, and among others won Jakob Zander of Bülach, called Schmid, for the Anabaptist cause. (Füssli III 249 Ottius 32; Egli, Aktensammlung no. 1366). It is improbable that he attended the first Zurich disputation with the Anabaptists on January 17, 1525, and the second on March 20, 1525; but it is certain that he was present at the third on November 6, 1525, for the authorities were now aware of him and expelled him on No. V. 18. He returned to his home town, but could not stay under the bloody regime of Ensisheim (the seat of the Austrian government of the Breisqau, located in Alsace.) He turned to Strassburg, where Capito, a leading evangelical minister, received him in his home.

The Theology of Sattler and Denk Compared

At Strassburg Sattler met Hans Denk; very soon the great difference in their views became apparent. Sattler adhered to the principles of the Zurich Brethren, whereas Denk was under the influence of Hubmaier. Sattler clung to the letter of the Scripture, whereas Denk rated the inner Word, the revelation of God in the human spirit, above the written Word. Both questioned the Lutheran doctrine of justification and also held works to be important to man's salvation, but they differed on Christ's work of redemption. Sattler agreed with the Protestants; Christ Jesus gave Himself for us to save us from all unrighteousness and to purify to Himself a people as His possession, zealous in all good works. Denk rejected the idea of human corruption, for every man, he said, bears in him a divine spark, and is related to God. Christ is our example and shows the way to become one with God. The confession of Christ's redemptive death was not valid to Denk. To be sure, he did not expressly say that Christ's death is not reckoned to the believer, but he put it into the background. On the other hand, he stressed that Christ by fulfilling the law has opened the path which no man could find alone. In other words, Denk's emphasis was on Christ as an example rather than as a sacrifice.

Sattler wanted to build a church of Christ, pure, God-fearing, and genuine, cleansed by the blood of Christ to be holy and blameless before God and men. His brethren were God's obedient children, who had separated from the world. Denk's writings contain practically nothing about the church and the world. Nowhere does

he discuss the relation of the church to the world and its attitude toward government, to war, or other requirements.

Sattler and Denk also differed on the value of baptism. Sattler believed that through baptism the believer was admitted into the church of the saints. Denk did not place much value on the sacraments, which were for him nothing more than external symbols. Denk's entire concept of church and baptism is derived from mysticism, as represented by Tauler, *Die Deutsche Theologie,* and the *Imitation of Christ.*

Sattler, like the reformers, taught that Christ came to save all who believe on Him, but that he who does not believe will be condemned. Denk taught that Christ died for all, and that God has destined all men for salvation. In Denk is seen the bold flight of the spirit which wants to penetrate into the deepest questions of faith. Sattler clung to humble simplicity and withdrew from high-flying spirits and scribes.

Sattler's Discussion with Bucer and Capito in Strassburg

After Denk, Ludwig Haetzer is found in Capito's home; but the serious, quiet, and upright Sattler was repelled by the restless and impure man. His association with Capito and Bucer was so much the more sincere, showing them the true piety of the Zurich Anabaptists and at the same time a deep inwardness and holy earnestness. The points of discussion between them were baptism, communion, power or sword, oath, and excommunication. Sattler drew up his articles of faith as follows:

(1) Christ has come to save all who believe in Him.

(2) He who believes and is baptized will be saved, but he who does not believe will be condemned.

(3) Faith in Christ reconciles us with the Father and gives access to Him.

(4) Baptism seals all the believers into the body of Christ, who is now their head.

(5) Christ is the head of His body, which is the believing church.

(6) As the Head, so shall the body be.

(7) The predestined, called believers, shall be conformed to the image of Christ.

(8) Christ despises the world; His children shall do the same.

(9) The believers have been chosen out of the world; therefore they hate the world.

(10) The devil is the prince of this world; through him all the children of darkness reign.

(11) Christ is the head of all spirits; through Him live all that walk in the light.

(12) The devil seeks to destroy, Christ to save.

(13) The flesh is at enmity with the spirit, the spirit with the flesh.

(14) The spiritual are Christ's, the carnal belong to death and the wrath of God.

(15) Christians are quite at rest and confident in their Father in heaven, without any external worldly armor.

(16) Christ's citizenship is in heaven, not on the earth.

(17) Christians are the family of God and citizens of the saints, not of the world.

(18) But they are the true Christians who do the teachings of Christ with works.

(19) Flesh and blood, display, worldly honor, and also the world cannot comprehend the teachings of Christ. In short, Christ and Belial have nothing in common.

Capito and Bucer discussed these points with Sattler in "brotherly discipline and peace," but did not reach an agreement. Sattler realized the untenability of his situation. On the one hand, he must have feared that the learned theologians would influence him to change his mind, which would for him denote a denial of God. On the other hand, he feared that if he persisted in his views he would fall into the hands of the authorities.

The Schleitheim Conference and Sattler's Arrest

It is probably right to assume that in the last months of 1526 Sattler went into the Hohenberg territory in Württemberg in response to an invitation by Reublin (not in 1527 as is assumed in *Zeitschrift fur historische Theologie,* 30.31). From there he wrote a letter of farewell to Capito and Bucer, justifying his departure. Reublin and Sattler divided the Hohenberg region between them, Reublin taking the work south of Rottenburg, and Sattler in the north, with his headquarters in Horb. Sattler was very successful and won a large following for the Anabaptist movement. His influence is indicated by the fact that he presided at the conference at Schleitheim on February 24, 1527. Sattler had the doctrine of the Swiss Brethren drawn up in seven points and sent to the brotherhood in the form of an epistle. Though these articles did not have

the status of a confession of faith, they offered a firm foundation for the Upper German and Swiss Anabaptists, and at the same time rejected a man like Haetzer, whom Sattler saw through at once. The goal set by Sattler for the Brethren was the creation of a holy church, which was forbidden all association with persons of other faiths, all participation in the religious services of Catholics or Protestants, all association in civilian life including trade, all acceptance of public office, all use of weapons and legal compulsion, and all swearing. At the same time Sattler created a proper organization. Each congregation chooses and dismisses its "shepherd." The "shepherd" has the leadership of the congregation in his hand in the broader sense, especially in conducting worship services, communion, reading, admonishing, teaching, reproving, and banning. Very carefully Sattler provided for the office of preaching during persecution, so that the congregations should never lack a firm hand, even though their preacher should be banished or killed. The seven articles of the Schleitheim Confession testify to Sattler's holy zeal, of unfeigned warmth and devotion. His goal was the creation of a holy church, separated from the world.

When Sattler returned from Schleitheim, the Anabaptists had already been discovered at Rottenburg, without Sattler's having any premonition of it. Then at the end of February he with his wife and Reublin's wife, Matthias Hiller and Veit Veringer of Rottenburg, and a number of men and women of Horb, were arrested. The government had made a valuable catch. For on Sattler were found not only the seven articles, but also some important written notations on the plans and activities of the Swiss Brethren. The government did not trust the feeling in Horb, and the prison was not strong enough or large enough for the great number of prisoners; therefore the prisoners, led by Count Joachim von Zollern and the foremost officials, with fourteen horses, were taken to the more secluded town of Binsdorf. Here Sattler wrote a letter of consolation to the congregation at Horb. He admonished them to be steadfast and bade them farewell. For he was constantly threatened, now with the rope, now with fire, and now with the sword. But these did not terrify him; with his wife and brethren he had committed himself entirely to the Lord, but he knew that martyrdom awaited him.

The Innsbruck (Austria) authorities, under whose jurisdiction this territory fell, had decided to hold court in Rottenburg, and on March 18 the towns of Ueberlingen, Radolfszell, Stockach, and Villingen received orders to send two judges each to Rottenburg. The University of Tübingen was also required to send two doctors

of the imperial law, since it was feared that laymen might pass an unsuitable verdict, and also because they wanted to be protected against public opinion, which might have accused the government of dealing too lightly with so serious a matter as a religious trial in committing it to the laity. The trial was set for April 12; but all sorts of hindrances interfered. Horb refused to deliver the prisoners to the court. The government was acquainted with his mood and had therefore taken the four Anabaptist leaders to Binsdorf.

The strictly Catholic university of Tübingen also flatly refused to send two lawyers, for they knew that the outcome would be a death sentence, which would disqualify them for the priesthood; some had already taken the first steps toward entering the priesthood, and others were planning to do so soon, and they could not be consecrated if they took part in a criminal court. The university also mentioned that it had a burden of work accruing from the courts in its own principality, whereas Rottenburg belonged to another rule. And finally they noted that the Rottenburg parish belonged to the University of Freiburg, which should therefore be interested in an ecclesiastical trial in Rottenburg.

Did the government feel that the real motive behind the university's refusal was a horror of the capital punishment its representatives were to approve?

With amazement the authorities noted the large number of appeals for mercy for the prisoners, an indication of the mood of the people. For Count Joachim, the man of indolent calm, and his officials, the entire case was most inconvenient. How easily they could have been relieved of the work of holding court by simply calling the imperial provost Aichele to hang the Anabaptists quietly on the nearest tree, as the Swabian League did! The Count actually made this proposal to the government. The government replied with a contemptuous allusion to the Swabian League, that the honor of the house of Austria did not permit execution without trial and sentence. Even Ferdinand, who in his hasty manner declared "the third baptism," i.e., drowning, the best antidote to Anabaptism, and who had expressed the wish that Sattler be drowned without delay by Aichele, but felt that for the others there was no need to hurry, was persuaded to postpone the court session to May 17; Ehingen was added to the towns mentioned above which were to send representatives. Freiburg also sent two men, though they were not members of the university. The Innsbruck authorities appealed to Stuttgart to use its influence on the University of Tübingen to persuade them to send two jurists; they were not to be doctors of spirit-

ual law, but of temporal law, who were laymen. Once more the university protested that it had no jurists but those who were now priests or about to take orders, and claimed papal and imperial law. Indeed, on May 6 the university sent two of its members to Stuttgart to present their refusal to send delegates. Stuttgart rejected the appeal, for it wanted to please Innsbruck. A clever evasion was agreed upon, probably suggested by Stuttgart. Two doctors actually went to Rottenburg; they were better paid than was usual for the first court session; they were, however, not doctors of law, but of the arts. They were Georg Farner of Kirchheim and Balthasar Stumpp of Waiblingen.

Now Innsbruck also considered it necessary to call two men from Ensisheim, the seat of the imperial government in Alsace, because of their wealth of experience in religious trials. But there was no other government with so bad a reputation as Ensisheim. Their lack of earnestness and strength was matched by an ambitious attitude, full of sycophancy toward their superiors and full of bloodthirstiness toward their inferiors. The men sent by Ensisheim had no lack of experience in nor of inclination for "Blutgericht." They were the city secretary Eberhard Hofmann and Jodokus Gundersheim, the city secretary of Neuenburg.

Michael Sattler and his wife, Veit Veringer, and Matthias Hiller, who had thus far spent eleven weeks and three days in jail, were taken to Rottenburg by the mayor of Binsdorf with twenty-four horsemen. Since Count Joachim feared a revolt in the town fifty-six additional foot soldiers were drawn from the villages of the lower district and sent to Rottenburg.

Sattler's Trial at Binsdorf

On Wednesday, May 15, the judges called to the trial were already assembled, so that the court could open. According to the Villingen chronicle the court consisted of twenty-four judges. The chairman was the Landeshauptmann Count Joachim of Zollern. The attorney for the defense was the mayor of Rottenburg, Jakob Halbmayer, whom Sattler made responsible for the outcome of the trial; but he appeared only at the beginning and the end of the trial. When the case became hot he felt inadequate to the position, and had Hofmann speak for him. The assumption is probably correct that this eloquent legal expert was the conspicuous character in the affair and that he was responsible for the cruel sentence, which aroused great excitement.

There are four accounts of the course of the trial; the simplest

and most credible has the title, *Ayn newes wunderbarliches geschicht von Michael Sattler zu Rottenburg am Neckar sampt andern 9 mannen seiner lere und glauben halben verbrannt und 10 wyaber ertrenkt,* 1527 (copy in the Wolfenbüttel library). This account is based on the narration of Klaus von Graveneck, a Swabian who had presumably been forced to come to Rottenburg with arms to protect the court. He was a Protestant. In the Peasants' War he had in person gathered a company of peasants and was therefore arrested, and not released until May 5, 1526. His sisters Kunigunde and Margarete had been nuns in the Königsfelden convent, but had married Zurich clergymen. The account was probably written by a brother-in-law of Klaus von Graveneck and sent to Zurich. The second account is an appendix to the *Brüderliche Vereinigung Etzlicher Kinder Gottes sieben Artikel betreffend,* and was headed, *Folgend die Artikel und Handhabung, so Michael Sattler zu Rottenburg am Neckar mit seinem Blut Bezeuget hat* (W. Köhler, *Flugschriften* II, no. 3). The third account is *Eines Wiedertaüffers Nachricht an die Brüder und Schwestern des Schweizer landes von Hinrichtung einiger ihrer Secte zu Rothenburg am Neckar und der dabei vorgefallenen Wunderzeichen,* printed in *Füssli* (II, 374-88), written by Wilhelm Reublin and sent to the Brethren in Zollikon, Grüingen, Basel, and Appenzell. A fourth account is found in the chronicles of the Hutterian Brethren, published by Josef Beck, pp. 26ff. A fifth account, written by Joh. Schlegel of Ravensburg, first prebendary at Zürichberg, then assistant in Dübendor, then three years in Bernese territory, ca. 1525 assistant in Hongy, 1528 pastor in Otelfinge, 1530 in Elgg, d. 1552, has not yet been found. Sattler gives brief but independent data in his *Geschichte der Herzöge von Württemberg* (II, 171ff.), certainly based upon material in the state archives.

Before the trial opened Count Joachim wished to put all the judges (*Beisitzer*) under oath that they would not be influenced by anything, favor, command, or gift, but would judge according to justice in a Christian and upright manner. But the judges refused to render this oath, protesting that their oath of fealty to their local government sufficed.

The trial opened on Friday, May 17, and continued on Saturday. On the bench of the accused sat Michael Sattler, his wife, Matthias Hiller, Veit Veringer of Rottenburg, and seven other men and eight other women. According to the Villingen chronicle there were fourteen defendants. First they were given their choice of attorney. Sattler, speaking for the group, declined the offer, since

it was not a legal matter. The way of the law was forbidden them by God's Word; he was willing to be shown the contrary from the Word of God. Sattler spoke in a courteous, modest, but definite manner. Very wisely he called the judges the servants of God, thereby on the one hand recognizing their authority, though of course only to the extent that it did not concern religious matters, and on the other hand he appealed to their conscience by calling attention to their responsibility. Sattler briefly questioned the competence of the court. But no attention was paid to this objection, for they had been appointed by the Austrian government.

The Charges Against Sattler

Count Joachim now had the charge read. It comprised nine articles, seven of which pertained to all the defendants, and two to Sattler alone. The charge is not unskillfully written, but it reveals that there was no understanding for the Anabaptist cause, and that the author did not even have the pertinent facts about the Anabaptists. An analysis of its contents follows.

The first article accused the Anabaptists of trespassing against the imperial mandates. Anabaptism was therefore to this court not only a religious crime, but also a civil crime. It did not mean the overthrow of the Roman Church, but of the entire Christian Church, an unchristian attack against the faith, which placed the Anabaptists on the same level as the Turks; and in addition it was a secret revolt. The mandates had been posted in all the churches and town halls. This being the case, the court was of course competent. The emperor is the protector of the church, this was the premise and conclusion of the medieval church—and the church is none but the Roman Catholic Church. The church, its doctrine, its organization, its law were alone valid on Austrian soil. What had been going on for ten years to prove the untenability of this medieval view did not exist for Austria; and where it showed itself it was to be extinguished like a dangerous fire.

The first article concerned the law of the church acknowledged by the empire; the others were concerned with the splendors of this church in its means of grace and miracles, first of all with its sacraments. The second article accounts the Anabaptist denial of the Roman doctrine of transubstantiation, indeed of the presence of Christ in the emblems, as a crime; the third, their rejection of infant baptism; the fourth, their rejection of the extreme unction. The seventh article, which is incorrectly placed, belongs here. It reproaches the Anabaptists with an unheard of practice in the com-

munion; they broke bread and wine together into a dish and took them together. It is not known where this charge originated. The seven articles of Schleitheim presuppose the Biblical manner of breaking bread. It must be assumed that a false rumor played a part here, connected with the term "breaking" the bread, which was foreign to the judges. From the Roman Catholic point of view breaking the bread was in itself unthinkable, since the bread was the body of Christ.

The fifth article accused the Anabaptists of despising the "Mother of God" and the saints. The sixth dealt with their refusal to swear an oath to the government. These were the charges made against all the Anabaptists.

The last two articles applied to Sattler alone. The eighth charged him with the crime of abandoning the monastic order and marrying; his appointment as an Anabaptist preacher was evaded. In the ninth article a statement of Sattler's, perhaps taken from one of his writings, was cleverly put at the conclusion, which made him an especially dangerous man in the eyes of any Austrian. He was accused of having taught that if the Turks came into the country, no resistance should be offered; indeed, if war could be morally justified, he would rather fight against the Christians than against the Turks. This charge could not fail to make the deepest impression on the court. The Turks for years had been considered the worst foe of the empire and the Christian faith. Vast sums of money had been sacrificed by the faithful and paid as a Turkish war tax to make war on the arch foe of Christendom. The Turk had caused Ferdinand inexpressible distress; at great pains he had aroused the German estates and raised an army to fight the Turks. And now the Turk was to be considered less dangerous than he and the representatives of the old faith. To be sure, Sattler was not charged, as other Anabaptists had been, with having made an alliance with the Turks, but the charge that was made was sufficient to make him an arch traitor to the empire.

A glance over the nine articles shows that the center of gravity rests in the first article, and that besides it only the sixth and ninth were important. Accusations concerning the erroneous views on the sacraments and disregard for the saints were actually the concern of the ecclesiastical court at Constance and not of the secular court at Rottenburg. How was the secular court to consider a man a criminal on the basis of a question of the communion or baptism or for marrying, when no other crime could be proved against him? Was Sattler not right in claiming that the court was not competent?

But the accusation was based on the law of the empire. The faith of the Catholic Church was the only legitimate one in the empire. This had been confirmed by all the imperial mandates since the Diet of Worms in 1521; and these mandates were alone valid in Rottenburg. The view of the law was still that of the Middle Ages. Opposed to it stood a new world in the person of Sattler and the Anabaptists. They sponsored the principle of faith and freedom of conscience and adherence to the Word of God, but this concerned only a minority and was not the law of the empire. To the representatives of the medieval world it must have appeared as arbitrariness, or even sedition. But the course of the trial was even for that time a horrifying one. Responsibility for this state of affairs must be placed on the indolence and clumsiness of the presiding judge and the venom of the secretary of Ensisheim.

The reading of the charge was followed by an hour's discussion; nothing is known of its content, for Klaus von Graveneck was not yet present. The discussion that followed this one indicates that Sattler had spoken of the Holy Spirit that had been given him, and that he had wished to speak in his own defense, but found no hearing (Sattler, *Gesch, der Herz. v. Württb.* II, 172). When Klaus arrived he heard Sattler request to have the articles read again, since there were so many of them, and then to be permitted to defend himself. The prosecutor rejected the request. Sattler demanded that the entire court decide the point. Count Joachim discussed it with the others, but they did not venture an opinion of their own. In their name Joachim declared that if the opposition had no objection the judges would be satisfied with his decision. The mayor of Rottenburg did not know how to handle the situation. Then the secretary of Ensisheim spoke for him and said, he had heard that Sattler had boasted of speaking in the Holy Spirit; the Spirit would then tell Sattler what was done and not let him forget anything. Sattler ventured to request modestly once more that the articles be reread, for the articles did not concern him alone and he was not sure of them. The secretary could not avoid doing so, but he made it appear as a concession, and had them given orally instead of being read.

Sattler's Defense

Sattler now consulted the other defendants as to the manner of the defense. Then he began, unafraid, skillfully, but modestly, discussing each article in its turn. At first he tried to refute the charge that the Anabaptists were disobedient to the imperial man-

dates; for these required that the Lutheran doctrine and error should not be followed, but alone the Gospel and the Word of Christ. This the Anabaptists had done. But the mandates threatened not only Lutheran doctrine, but all deviation from the Gospel as Rome understood it; to the Catholics, the Anabaptists were merely a Lutheran sect.

On the second article Sattler admitted at once that the Anabaptists rejected the teaching of the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the communion and attempted to prove his point as Luther and Zwingli had done: Christ had gone to heaven and was seated at God's right hand. If He is in heaven He is not in the bread and cannot be eaten. Also in the third article Sattler admitted the charge. He did not try to conceal that the Anabaptists repudiated infant baptism. The command to baptize has faith precede baptism. Baptism is merely the symbol of the covenant with Christ. On the extreme unction Sattler made a distinction between oil as a creation of God, which is good, and the pope's oil. The pope had never created anything good. The oil mentioned by Mark and James was not the pope's oil. Here Sattler had a good point, but he assumed too much on the part of the judges.

The charge that the Anabaptists despised Mary and the saints Sattler could deny with a good conscience; but he had to admit that according to their opinion Mary was not yet elevated, but, like all men, awaiting the judgment, and they did not accept her as a mediator and intercessor. But in the eyes of the court, such an attitude was contempt. As saints Sattler would acknowledge only those who live and believe. Dead believers he called the "blessed ones."

The charge that they refused to render an oath Sattler justified with Matt. 5:34 and 37.

The charge that the Anabaptists ate bread mingled with wine as the Lord's Supper Sattler hardly found it necessary to refute; at least none of the accounts of the trial recorded it.

After Sattler had answered the charges against the Anabaptists in general he turned to the accusations made specifically against him. He justified his departure from the monastery with the knowledge derived from the study of the Pauline epistles, that the monastic position was an unchristian, deceptive, and dangerous one; and from his own experience of the life and conduct of the monks and priests, their show, deception, usury, and great fornication, in seducing this man's wife, that one's daughter, and the third man's maid. Paul had prophesied this in I Tim. 4:3.

Concerning the last point Sattler admitted that he had taught that if the Turk should come, no armed resistance should be made, for it is written, Thou shalt not kill. We should not resist any of our persecutors with the sword, but with prayer cling to God, that He may resist and defend. Sattler even admitted having said that if war were right, he would rather march against supposed Christians who persecute, capture, and kill the God-fearing. The Turk knows nothing about the Christian faith; he is a Turk according to the flesh. But you want to be considered Christians, boast of being Christ's, and still persecute His pious witnesses. You are Turks according to the spirit. To this strong admonition to the conscience of the court, Sattler added in conclusion that it was their calling to punish the wicked and protect the good. He could bear witness that the Anabaptists had done nothing contrary to God and the Gospel. Likewise the closest examination would substantiate that he and his brethren had never opposed the government by any act or word, neither in revolt nor sedition, nor in any other way. He demanded that experts be called and the Bible used in the original languages; a debate should be arranged. The Anabaptists were ready to be taught from the Bible. If they were proved to be in error, they would gladly bear the punishment. "But if we are not shown to be in error, I hope to God that you will accept teaching and be converted." The idea that the judges might be taught and converted by Sattler seemed so peculiar to them that they put their heads together and burst out laughing. The secretary of Ensisheim snapped at Sattler, "Yes, you rascal of a monk, should we dispute with you? Yes, the hangman shall and will dispute with you." The chairman found not a word to say in defense of the accused. Sattler did not allow himself to be disturbed and replied, "What God wills, will happen." His calm earnestness irritated the city secretary, so that he cried, "Indeed, it would be good if you had never been born, you arch-heretic; you have seduced pious people. If they would only acknowledge their error and commit themselves to mercy!" Sattler replied, "Mercy is with God." One of the other defendants said, "It is wrong to deviate from the truth." Now the wrath of the secretary reached its limit. He cried, "Yes, you desperate rascal, you arch-heretic, I say, if there were no hangman here, I would hang you myself and be doing God a good service thereby." According to Reublin's report he had partly unsheathed his sword and said, "If you do not desist, I will execute you myself with this sword." Reublin probably confused a later scene with this one.

The Sentence and the Execution

The secretary may have felt that his poisonous attitude was making an unfavorable impression on the court, and began to speak in Latin with Sattler; this Klaus could not record, for he did not understand it. He remembered only Sattler's last word, "judica." Now the city secretary became aware that he was playing a role that was not his. He therefore turned to Count Joachim with the words, "He will not cease this chatter today anyway. Therefore you may proceed with the sentence; I call for the decision of the court." Now Count Joachim asked Sattler whether he wished to ask for the verdict. Sattler replied, "You servants of God, I am not sent to judge the Word of God; we are sent to testify; but we are not for that reason removed from being judged, and we are ready to suffer and to await what God is planning to do with us. We will continue in our faith in Christ as long as we have breath until we are shown from the Scripture to be wrong." Again the city secretary replied instead of the chairman, repeating the threat, "The hangman will instruct you and will debate with you, you arch-heretic." Sattler replied, "I appeal to the Scriptures." At this point the discussion was broken off. The judges withdrew to consult on the verdict. Their discussion evidently did not proceed as smoothly as the city secretary had imagined, for it lasted one and a half hours.

The Anabaptists were then committed to the soldiers. Sattler saw himself subjected to scenes similar to those his Lord and Master had experienced. One cried to him, "When I see you get away, I will believe in you." Another seized his sword from the table, drew it, and said, "See, with this we will dispute with you." Klaus von Graveneck was horrified by all these words of contempt which were not at all fitting to the gravity of the situation; he felt that in such a situation one would have pitied the worst murderer, and here he saw innocent people tortured with words without any protection. Sattler was silent toward all personal insults. This annoyed the soldiers. One of the prisoners said, "Pearls should not be cast before the swine." Once more Sattler began to speak when someone asked him why he had not remained a lord in a monastery. It seemed incomprehensible to the man that anyone would for the sake of his faith sacrifice the haughty rank of a priest and the comfortable life of a prior in a monastery. Then Sattler answered, "According to the flesh I would have been a lord, but it is better so," and then showed from the Scriptures that his exchange was a fortunate one.

The period of painful waiting came to an end. The judges reappeared. The verdict was read. It read, ". . . Michael Sattler

. . . shall be committed to the executioner. The latter shall take him to the square and there first cut out his tongue, then forge him fast to a wagon and there with glowing iron tongs twice tear pieces from his body, then on the way to the site of execution five times more as above and then burn his body to powder as an arch-heretic."

Klaus von Graveneck adds, "All this I saw myself. May God grant us also to testify of Him so bravely and patiently." Reublin's narrative makes it clear that the trial lasted two days and that the verdict was read on Saturday, May 18.

When the sentence was read, Sattler's wife comforted him with great joy in the view of the entire crowd, as Reublin relates.

Before the prisoners were led away, Sattler had another conversation in a private chamber with the mayor of Rottenburg, whom Sattler had made responsible for the final verdict, although it is to be assumed that the city secretary of Ensisheim bore most of the guilt for the sentence. Sattler said to the mayor, "You know that you with your fellow judges have sentenced me contrary to law; therefore take care and repent. If you do not, you will with them be condemned to eternal fire in God's judgment."

Three more days were granted Sattler. Reublin is probably correct when he says, "What fear, conflict, and struggle flesh and spirit must have undergone, cannot be imagined." Sattler had agreed with his group to give a sign as evidence of his constance and cheer. There is a difference of opinion concerning the day of Sattler's death. The Anabaptist chronicles and the *Ausbund* give May 21 as the day of his martyrdom. Klaus von Graveneck gives May 20. Reublin says, "Sattler lay in prison from Saturday to Monday and was executed on that day." It is most likely that the Anabaptist chronicles became confused in their counting by the termination of the imprisonment "until the third day," and thought Sattler was executed on Monday, May 20. This is also the opinion of Hulshof (p. 65) and *Baum, Capito and Butzer* (p. 373).

First Sattler was taken to the market place and a piece cut from his tongue, but not enough to prevent speech. Then pieces were torn from his body twice with glowing tongs. Then he was forged to a cart, and between the city gate and the place of execution the tongs were applied five times again. The number of times the tongs were used is variously given. The sentence ordered two and five applications, Reublin speaks of six, Capito in his letter to the Council of Horb of two and five. The place of execution is a quarter hour's walk from the town close to the highway of Tübingen. The tortures of the unfortunate victim under the tongs, a

monstrous heightening of the execution, must have been unspeakable, but nothing could shake Sattler. On the market place and the site of execution he prayed for his persecutors and Klaus von Graveneck. When he was bound to the ladder with ropes to be pushed into the fire, he admonished the people to be converted, to repent and fear God, and to intercede for his judges. Then he turned to the judges. He especially remembered the mayor and the admonition given him in private. The mayor replied defiantly and angrily that Sattler should concern himself now only with God. Then Sattler prayed, "Almighty, eternal God, Thou art the way and the truth; because I have not been shown to be in error, I will with Thy help to this day testify to the truth and seal it with my blood."

Reublin says that a sack of powder had been tied around Sattler's neck to hasten his death. He was now thrown into the fire on the ladder; when his voice could be heard bright and clear with prayer and praise. Soon the ropes on his hands were burned through. He could now raise the two forefingers of his hands, thereby giving the promised signal to his group, and prayed, "Father, I commend my spirit into Thy hands."

Reublin could not avoid adorning Sattler's death with miracles. He reports that Sattler's right hand and his heart did not burn. The executioner cut the heart to pieces, the blood spurting high toward heaven. In the night after Sattler's death the sun and moon were seen for three hours above the site of execution with golden letters in them. The glow had been so bright that everyone thought it was midday. The authorities forbade anyone's speaking of it under oath, in order to suppress the matter. The death of Sattler, steadfast to the end as a martyr to his faith, does not need the additions of Reublin's imagination.

Three other Anabaptists were executed, among them Matthias Hiller. The furrier's apprentice of St. Gaul, the wife of Stoffel Schuhmacher, and Salome Katlerin of Rottenburg had recanted publicly. These like all other recanting Anabaptists were lighted out of Rottenburg with burning torches, and expelled forever from Austrian territory. Veit Veringer, who had first recanted and then returned to the Anabaptists, lay in the prison at Schomberg for 13½ weeks and was then executed. Val. Anshelm relates that the countess of Hechingen, i.e., the wife of Joachim von Zollern, tried to persuade Sattler's wife to desist from her faith and stay at the court of the countess. But she declared that she would be true to her Lord and to her Christian husband, and was drowned in the Neckar on

the eighth day after her husband's death. She would have preferred to die in the fire with him. According to some reports, she was drowned on Wednesday, May 22.

The Reaction of the Public

Sattler's character lies clearly before us. He was not a highly educated divine and not an intellectual; but his entire life was noble and pure, true and unadulterated. The impression made by this death sentence in Rottenburg was enormous. Klaus von Graveneck's horror is clearly felt in his report. It is as if the hand of Heinrich Hug, the chronicler of Villingen, trembled when he concluded his narrative about the Anabaptists in Rottenburg with the words, "It was a miserable affair, they died for their conviction" (Publikation des *Literarischen Vereins* 164, p. 459). Especially great was the impression on Strasburg, where Sattler was personally known. Word had scarcely been received there that four others had been executed in addition to Sattler, and that still others lay in prison, when Capito seized his pen and on May 31 wrote to the council of Horb, "This Michael is known to us here in Strasburg and he was somewhat in error, which we showed him through the Scriptures; but since he saw a lack in our preachers and other preachers of the true doctrine, especially in the outward life of the congregation, he perhaps paid less attention to our admonition. But at the same time he showed such great zeal for the honor of God and the Church of Christ, which he would have pure and blameless and without reproach to those who are outside. We never censured this but praised it highly, but his method and the articles of his faith we always kindly rejected, and that after mature reflection before God. Now we did not agree with him herein. He wanted to make pious Christians through a fixed creed and outward compulsion, which we considered the beginning of a new monkery. But we desire to correct the life of the believers though consideration of God's good deeds, which he has shown us in body and soul, that it might be a fruit of love and gratitude, for this is the way and the order of salvation" (*Baum, Capito and Butzer,* p. 373). Bucer speaks with equal respect in his *Getrewen Warnung* (July, 1527): "We do not doubt that Michael Sattler, who was burned at Rottenburg, was a dear friend of God, although he was a leader of the Anabaptists, but much more skilled and honorable than some."

Reublin's booklet seriously embarrassed the Austrian government, which would have liked to issue a counter report, but feared that nothing fruitful would result, and rightly so. But one con-

sequence of the enormous excitement caused by Sattler's execution can be observed. In Württemburg the authorities now had the Anabaptists indoctrinated by clergymen, namely, by the Tübingen professor Käuffelin, to persuade them to recant.

The Anabaptists also ascribed to Sattler the hymn, *Als Christus mit seiner wahren Lehr,* which is in the *Ausbund* of 1583. Keller (A.D.B. 30, 412) considers Sattler the author of the leaflet, *Wie die Gschrift verstendiglich soll unterschieden und erklärt werden,* O.O.u.J.

Michael Sattler was as deserving of a monument at the site of his execution as John Huss in Constance.

Bibliography: Josef Beck, *Geschichtsbücher der Wiedertäufer in Oesterreich-Ungarn* (*Fontes rerum Austriacarum* XLIII), Vienna, 1883); J. C. Füssli, *Beiträge zur Kirchen und Reformations —geschichte des Schweizerlandes II* (Zurich, 1742) p. 374. E. Egli, *Aktensammlung zur Geschichte der Zuricher Reformation* (Zurich 1879); Otte, *Annales Anabaptistici* (Basel, 1672) Veesenmeyer, "Von Michael Sattler," in *Kirchenhistorischen Archiv* (1826) p. 476; C. A. Cornelius, *Geschichte des Münsterschen Aufruhrs,* (Leipzig, 1855-60); Baum, *Capito und Butzer* (Elberfeld, 1860); *Allgemeine Deutsche Biographie,* Jhr. 30, 411; G. Bossert, "Michael Sattler," in *Blätter für württb. Kirchengeschichte* (1891), 67-69, 73, 75, 81-83, 89, 90; 1892, 1-4, 9-10; Camille Gerbert, *Geschichte der Strassburger Sektenbewegung* (Strassburg, 1889); G. Bossert (Introduction only) *Beschreibung des Oberamtes Rottenburg* vol. I, (1899) 409 ff.; G. Bossert, *Das Blutgericht von Rottenburg* (Barmen, 1892); A. Baur, *Zwinglis Theologie* (Halle, 1885, 1889) p. 186; *Zwinglis Werke* III (Leipzig, 1914) 357 ff; *Bibliotheca reformotioria Neerlandica,* 262-69; W. Köhler, *Brüderlich Vereinigung etzlicher Kinder Gottes, sieben Artikel betreffend, Item ein Sendbrief Michael Sattlers an eine Gemeine Gottes samt seinem Martyrium* (1527) in; *Flugschriften aus den ersten Jahren der Reformation* II, (Leipzig, 1908) 38, 277-337; R. Wolkan, *Lieder der Wiedertaufer,* (Berlin, 1905); A. Hulshof, *Geschiedenis van de Doopsgezinden te Straatsburg van* 1527 *tot* 1557 (Amsterdam, 1905), pp. 24ff.; Valerius Anshelm, *Bernische Chronik, herausgegeben vom historischen Verein zu Bern* (Bern, 1896) 5, 185, 186, 17, 492-492, 24, 451; G. Bossert, in Herzog-Hauck, *Realencyclopädie.* (3rd. Ed.) Vol. 17, 492-494, 24, 451; F. Spittov, "Michael Sattler als Dichter," in *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* XXXV (1914), pp. 393-402.

Bibliographical and Research Notes

Eberhard Arnold, 1883-1939

A Short Biography

Eberhard Arnold was born in Königsberg, Germany, July 26, 1883, and died in Darmstadt, Germany, November 22, 1935. He was the founder and spokesman in the establishment of a new Hutterian bruderhof in Germany, which continues to live in its daughter colonies in England and in Paraguay. On his mother's side he was of German descent, on his father's American, his father having been born in Williamsfield, Ohio. Under the live impressions of a strongly revivalistic Christianity, Arnold felt keenly the injustices of the distinctions in class and society, as he encountered them in his strictly religious parental home and in school, attending a gymnasium in Breslau, where his father was professor of church history. Arnold studied theology, philosophy, and pedagogy at the universities of Breslau, Halle, and Erlangen. In 1908 he received his doctor's degree with a thesis on "Urchristliches und Antichristliches im Werdegang Friedrich Nietzsches." After his marriage with Emy v. Hollander he spoke and wrote in Leipzig, Halle, and Berlin from 1909 to 1913 in the interests of genuine love of Christ and a renewal of life in the powers of the Gospel. Then an illness compelled him to retire to southern Tyrol, where in the silence of the mountains he was able to penetrate deeper into the nature and the demands of Jesus. The witness of these years was the book *Der Krieg, ein Aufruf zur Innerlichkeit* which was further developed as a first draft of the book *Innenland, ein Wegweiser in die Seele der Bibel.* It was first Hermann Kutter and later Blumhard, father and son, who led him ever deeper into the central message of the entire Gospel, namely, the approaching kingdom of God. In his investigation of the spiritual movements Arnold very early came across the Anabaptists and in 1910 he published the article, "Zur Geschichte des christliches Liedes: Die ältesten Lieder der Täufergemeinden." Meanwhile he was active as the secretary of the German Christian student union and as the literary head of the Furche-Verlag in Berlin (1915-1920). After the first World War he came into lively contact with the *Jugendbewegung* (youth movement), whose genuine quest for originality and natural living he sought to direct to realization in Christ (*see* his book, *Die Religiösität der heutigen Jugend,* Berlin, 1919).

Under the influence of this movement and the powerful impression of the Sermon on the Mount, the Arnold family and several others in 1920 initiated communal living of a primitive Christian and primitive Anabaptist nature in Sannerz. Through the instigation of the Holy Spirit a brotherhood came into being, to which the entire life of Eberhard Arnold was devoted from this time on, with service within and witness without the community. The periodical *Das neue Werk* and the books of the *Neuwerk-Verlag* served this new organization. In addition to his very intensive work in writing and publishing and the spiritual care of the numerous seeking guests and helpers, the community devoted itself to horticulture and agriculture and social and educational work with children, youth, and adults. The collaboration of this small congregation with the Neuwerkbewegung ended in 1922, when a division occurred between the more and more ecclesiastical Neuwerk and the circle in Sannerz which sought earnestly a radical discipleship, which would place all the areas of life under the unifying and

decisive leadership of the spirit of Christ, without granting to any area, such as for instance the economic, any self-determination. Then Arnold began to publish in his own plant, named *Gemeinschaftsverlag,* and later *Eberhard Arnold-Verlag,* the *Quellen christlicher Zeugnisse aus allen Jahrhunderten* (Christian Testimonies from all the centuries), the first volume of which, *Die ersten Christen nach dem Tode der Apostel,* was compiled and introduced by him. The periodical *Die Wegwarte,* which was published from 1926 to 1928, contains various articles from Arnold's pen, as do also *Die Furche* and other German magazines.

The Biblicist radicalism of the primitive Anabaptists paralleled the Sannerz experience exactly in its faith and pattern of living. Therefore, when the brotherhood moved to the near-by Sparhof in 1926, the expanded communal work was called a "bruderhof" after the example of the Hutterian households. Already in 1928 Eberhard Arnold had established contacts with the Hutterian Brethren in America and continued to work for the union of the young circle with the century-old communal movement. The republication of Ehrenpreis' *Sendbrief,* the fraternal relations in the publication of the *Wegwarte* and the "Michel-Hasel-Book," the publication in the German language of Bertha W. Clark's study, "Die Hutterischen Gemeinschaften," and the *Grundlagen und Ordnungen* (now in mss. in Primavera, Alto Paraguay), are the literary evidences of this development. During a trip to and through America in 1930-1931, Arnold visited all the bruderhofs in South Dakota, Manitoba, and Alberta. His adoption into the community of brethren known as the Hutterites and the commission entrusted to him are attested in the following document (in translation):

The Hutterian Brethren March 20, 1931
Stand-Off Colony, Macleod, Alta.

To the bruderhofs

Information to the Hutterian congregations.

1. On Dec. 9, 1930, Eberhard Arnold of the German bruderhof of the church of God, was incorporated into the brotherhood, who are called the Hutterites, at the Stand-Off Colony, with the teaching of Matt. 28, by Elias Walter, Christian Waldner, Johannes Kleinsasser, Johannes Entz in the presence of the Stand-Off Colony and Joseph Wipf and Jerg Waldner.
2. On Dec. 19, 1930, Eberhard was confirmed in the service of the Word with laying on of hands by the elders Christian Waldner, Elias Waldner, Johannes Kleinsasser and Johannes Entz. It took place in the Stand-Off Colony with the teaching of Titus 1, which was delivered by Johannes Kleinsasser of the Buck Ranch bruderhof. Thereby the commission of the brotherhood was given to Eberhard Arnold for Germany, there to proclaim the Word of God, gather the zealous, and to establish in the best order the bruderhof existing in Neuhof (Fulda) in Hesse-Nassau.

(Signed) Elias Waldner

With the vigorous support both inwardly and externally of the North American bruderhofs the Rhoenbruderhof was built up upon Arnold's return as the sending station and the gathering place of the zealous. A printing shop was installed to publish the material on the Anabaptist movement collected by Arnold in Europe and America. In co-operation with Professor Johann Loserth of Graz the printing of the *Klein Geschichtbuch* was undertaken, with annotations in which Arnold incorporated the fruits of years of research. Various articles for periodicals, for the *Mennonitisches Lexikon,* etc., were published; a summarizing report on the Hutterian Brethren was also published in English, entitled *The Hutterian Brothers* (Ashton Keynes, 1940). Other articles by Arnold were published in English in the *Plough,* and an English translation of *Innenland,* which was published in German in 1936, is about completed. An intensive work in the

inner strengthening of the community with deeply stirring guest addresses and public lectures went hand in hand with the external development of the Rhönbruderhof near Fulda, Hesse-Nassau.

The rise of National Socialism in Germany in 1933 was accompanied by appreciable difficulty and finally a complete close of the work in Germany. First the publication work of the *Klein Geschichtbuch* had to be stopped. Since the educational work of the colony was interfered with by the Gestapo, a new settlement, the Almbruderhof, was made in 1934 in the principality of Liechtenstein, a task to which Arnold had to devote the major portion of his time. In addition to many petitions to the authorities, in which Arnold stressed the peaceable character of the brotherhood and its extensive commission in the kingdom of God, he completely rewrote *Innenland* to present the truth of the bruderhof against the errors of the time. A journey undertaken in the spring of 1935 to Holland, England, and Scotland in the interests of the development of the bruderhof brought him in closer contact with the Dutch Mennonites and the English Quakers. From the thick of all these tasks Eberhard Arnold was suddenly snatched by death on Nov. 22, 1939.

Confident expectation of the coming of the kingdom of God, which would reveal itself in repentance and a radical change in beginning a new life of love and justice in fraternal communion and a sincere responsibility for public life, was the fundamental recognition and act of this life. Christ is the decisive new dawn of God in history, His Spirit unites the brotherhood in the here and now in the authorization of missionary enterprise in all the world. Its practical life already today corresponds everywhere, wherever Christ is accepted in His entirety, in agreement with the prophetic and apostolic word, with the character of the coming kingdom. Community of goods, baptism of faith, memorial Lord's Supper as a unifying meal of the entire brotherhood, church discipline, ordinances in the sense of organic differentiation inwardly, correspond to the commission, the radical testimony of peace and the readiness to suffer outwardly. In all these points the *Artikelbücher,* the *Rechenschaft* by Peter Riedemann, the epistles, *Vorreden,* doctrines, hymns, and organization of the brethren, who are called the Hutterites, were fundamental and directive.

The work of completely communal living begun by Eberhard Arnold was upon his death and the expulsion of the colony from Germany in 1940-1941 carried forward in the Cotswald bruderhof and the Oaksey bruderhof in England. Today it still remains on the same foundation in the Wheathill bruderhof in England and the three bruderhofs in Primavera, Paraguay.

E. C. H. Arnold

Two Letters of 1889 from the J. F. Funk collection.

I. *U.S. Secretary of State James G. Blaine to John F. Funk*

Washington, Oct. 9, 1889
Department of State,

John F. Funk, Esqre.,
320 Main Street,
Elkhart, Ind.

Sir:

I have to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 4th instant, in which you enquire the meaning of the oath required of applicants for passports that they will "support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic." You state that being a Mennonite and a non-resistant in faith, and entertaining as you do an intention to make an early trip to Europe, it is a matter of interest to you to know whether the oath above required means to defend with arms and at the cost of human life.

In reply I have to say that the oath above quoted is in the ordinary form of an oath of allegiance, and either it or an affirmation to the same effect is required of every applicant for a passport before one can be issued to him. The oath is not understood to refer to any particular form of support or defence, but only to contemplate the general performance of the duties of citizenship. What might be its interpretation or application under any particular circumstances, or in respect to any particular class of persons, is a question which is not within the province of this Department to determine, and upon which, therefore, it would not be proper to venture an opinion.

I am, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Signed) James G. Blaine

II. *N. B. Grubb to John F. Funk*

Philadelphia, Pa., August 27, 1889

Rev. J. F. Funk,
Elkhart, Indiana.

Dear Brother in the Lord—In reply to yours of July 24, will say that I have left the copy of Denner's Predigt Book with the Nat. Pub. Co., as directed. With regard to the little bit of history connected with the Herstein-Schmutz edition I will give you the story as I have often heard it told by the late Pre. Moses H. Gottschall, who in turn had it from the lips of John Herstein, who it seems often spoke of the incident. In substance it is the following, and if at any time you see fit to use it you are at liberty to do so:

The edition of Denner's Predigt Book published 1792, comprised 1000 copies, and were printed for John Herstein and John Schmutz, and at their expense. The printing was done secretly by a catholic woman and the books brought to America by Herstein & Schmutz. A voyage across the ocean then was more difficult than now. When the books were made ready to be shipped the catholic woman said, "the ship that carries these books across the water will have a safe and prosperous journey to America. The book is a good one and Denner was a good man." Tradition has it that the woman herself became an earnest christian woman.

The books arrived safe at their destination, Limerick Township, Montgomery County, Pa. John Herstein took 500 copies, and a number of the so-called Basel Bible, which were also brought along, and in a short time had

them sold among the Mennonites in Montgomery, Chester and Bucks counties, Pa. Schmutz also took 500 copies and went to sell them in Lancaster county, among the Mennonites there. After some time he returned to Limerick, having only sold a few copies. On his return he (Schmutz) remarked that "had I driven a lot of oxen to Lancaster county I would have sold them in a short time, but I can sell no books. The people are only bent on fattening oxen for the market." Herstein then took the books and in a very short time had them sold too, and that in the same territory where he had sold the other 500.

The mortal remains of the sainted Herstein lie mingled with kindred dust in the old Shoemaker burial ground, now known as Herstein's School house, in Limerick, Mongomery co., Pa., but nothing is left to mark the exact spot of his resting place.

I remain in Christian Love Your Brother.

(Signed) N. B. Grubb.

2136 Franklin Street, Phila'da, Pa.

Editorial notes. John F. Funk (1835-1930) was a pioneer publisher of the Mennonite Church, at Elkhart, Indiana, also a minister and bishop there. He never made the contemplated trip to Europe.

N. B. Grubb (1850-1939) was long-time pastor of the First Mennonite Church in Philadelphia. The *Denner's Predigtbuch* was a collection of sermons preached in Altona (Hamburg), Germany, in Dutch by the Mennonite preacher Jacob Denner (1659-1746), first printed in Hamburg in 1730 in German translation, reprinted in Germany in 1739 and in 1751, and in Philadelphia in 1860. The edition here referred to was printed at Frankenthal am Rhein (Germany) in 1792, and bears the following title: *Jacob Denners christlich- und erbauliche betrachtungen über die sonn- und festtags-evangelia des ganzen jahres, nebst einem anhange verschiedener predigten über besondere texte, sowohl aus dem Alten als Neuen Testemente; und einer vermehrung von dreyen predigten über das heilge Vater Unser. Durch Gottes gnade in öffentlicher versammlung in Altona mündlich vorgetragen, und auf begehren dem druck überlassen. Neue, auf kosten Johannes Herrstein und Johannes Schmutz gemachte auflage. Welcher die betrachtung vom adel des gewissens, und eine nachricht von den lebens-umständen des seligen herrn Denners beygefügt worden. Frankenthal am Rhein gedruckt bei Ludwig Bernhard Friedrich Gegels, seel. Wittib, 1792. (1502 pp.)* (Capitalization omitted).

BOOK REVIEWS

The Dagger and the Cross. By Culbert G. Rutenber. New York: Fellowship Publications, 1950. Pp. 134. $1.00.

This book is a delightfully fresh and concise statement of realistic Christian pacifism which is certain to be a substantial contribution to current peace thought and literature. It is notable that it comes from the pungent pen of the Professor of Philosophy of Religion at Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, representing a group of vigorous evangelical descendants of the Anabaptists who are ordinarily not of the pacifist variety. Its 134 pages are packed with devastating argument against Christian participation in war for, as the title and the prefatory statement so lucidly suggest, when the dagger and the cross are confused, or even fused, they constitute one of the most intolerable incongruities of modern Christendom. In the early church, "The cross was for offense, the angels for defense. . . . And the dagger? Let us leave the dagger for those who know neither cross nor angels" (p. 9).

Written in an attractive readable style which at times is almost conversational, this book will appeal to laymen as well as to more serious students. In his chapter, "Pull Up a Chair," the author distinguishes between two main varieties of Christian pacifism as that of "non-violent resistance" and that of "nonresistance" as presented by Guy F. Hershberger. Rutenber takes his position in favor of the former without attacking the latter, believing the former to be more in harmony with the New Testament and more relevant to modern life.

His discussion of Niebuhr's attack on pacifism is especially helpful. Since modern pacifism has been largely associated with a theological liberalism which is now rapidly waning because of its unrealistic view of human nature and history, the burning issue is whether pacifism can find a more solid Biblical and theological foundation. The author makes an earnest effort to give an affirmative answer.

The author finds ample New Testament ground for Christian pacifism and argues that the Old Testament must be interpreted in the light of the New. He is not embarrassed by the wars in the Old Testament, for he insists that they occurred "under historical circumstances . . . that can never recur" (p. 69). He argues that Christ's teaching of love for all men "forever made an appeal to the Old Testament on the problem of war irrelevant and obsolete" (p. 72).

The author's realism appears further in his discussion on the problems of "Love, Justice and the State" in which he frankly recognizes the intricacy of the issues involved but pleads convincingly that the State also has moral responsibility for its acts and that the Christian is not absolved from all guilt if he murders "for the State." Moreover, he rejects the naive optimism of many pacifists that human history is moving inevitably toward a warless society. Neither human experience nor the New Testament promise a warless world in history, but Biblical realism speaks of both the coming of Christ and the coming of Antichrist in the end time and envisions the consummation of the kingdom as lying beyond history.

Mennonite readers will undoubtedly take issue with the author on some points but in general will find the Biblical and theological climate of this book very congenial and encouraging.

Bethel College Erland Waltner

Christian Mutual Aid: A Handbook of Brotherhood Economics. (Section for Mennonite Aid Publication Number 3) By J. Winfield Fretz. Akron, Pa.: The Mennonite Central Committee, 1947. Pp. 90.

This booklet of ten chapters was written "to foster the development of a program of mutual aid among the Mennonites. It assumes that the Mennonites in their various groups constitute Christian brotherhoods based upon a personal experience of faith in Jesus Christ as Saviour and Lord and a loving fellowship in His body, the church. On this foundation it advocates that the members of the Christian community, locally and as a whole, bear one another's economic burdens and so not only fulfill the law of Christ, but strengthen the brotherhood for its greater tasks of witnessing and building for Christ in the world of today." The foreword, written by an official of the Mennonite Central Committee, says that this assumption "is squarely within the authentic historic tradition of the Anabaptist-Mennonite movement with its spirit of stewardship, mutual burden-bearing, and practical brotherly aid."

The experiences of the second World War served to reawaken the conscience of the Mennonites concerning this great truth. In fact the church's support of Civilian Public Service was a great program of mutual aid on a church-wide scale. The assistance which the churches, through the Mennonite Central Committee, gave to the migration of thousands of refugees to North and South America was an even greater mutual aid program. It is not surprising therefore that as men who had given from one to four years of their time to C.P.S. were being discharged, the M.C.C. and the churches gave considerable thought to how the principle of mutual aid might best be applied in helping these men to find their way into normal peacetime occupations again.

This reawakened interest in Mennonite mutual aid is given fine expression in J. Winfield Fretz's *Christian Mutual Aid.* After explaining what mutual aid is, the author devotes a chapter to mutual aid as a fundamental principle of nature, and another to the Scriptural teaching on the subject. Two chapters are devoted to mutual aid in theory and practice in Mennonite history, and two others give a description of Mennonite mutual aid practices today. These include such varied practices as aid plans in case of property losses, as by fire and storm; mutual aid in case of sickness and death; co-operative elevators, creameries, oil stations, and light and telephone organizations; credit unions, land settlement plans, and other types of mutual aid. The author covers the entire scope of modern Mennonitism including Russia, western Europe, and North and South America.

Chapter X sets forth present-day needs for mutual aid, calling special attention to the need for helping Mennonite youth in getting a financial start. One section is devoted to a much-needed emphasis on the Christian responsibility for the investment of funds in such enterprises as are consistent with the Christian ethic and the spirit of brotherhood. Certainly brethren with money to invest should place it where it will be of help to needy young people and where it will make a contribution to the life of the spiritual community, rather than to some enterprise which pays well financially, the ethical connections of which may be questionable. Chapter IX gives practical suggestions for organizing mutual aid in the local community. The final chapter explains what mutual aid can mean to the church: demonstration of brotherhood; loyalty of youth for the church; reduction of materialistic practices among church members; making de-

pendence upon the state less necessary. There is a brief but helpful bibliography.

Goshen College Guy F. Hershberger

Annotated Bibliography on the Amish. An Annotated bibliography of Source Materials Pertaining to the Old Order Amish Mennonites. By John A. Hostetler. Scottdale, Pa.: Mennonite Publishing House, 1951. Lithographed. Pp. xx +100. $1.50.

In recent years, there has been an increasing demand for a book like this one recently produced by John A. Hostetler, a young scholar of Amish background, who not only knows several Amish communities intimately but has also studied the Amish people in his graduate courses in the field of sociology. Mennonite colleges are constantly receiving letters from students in widely scattered schools asking for information on the Amish. The Lancaster, Pennsylvania, Chamber of Commerce and other organizations having a knowledge of Amish life are approached continually by those who would know more about these unusual but interesting American citizens. Hereafter this book can be recommended to all such inquirers.

The introduction by Harold S. Bender, under whose direction the work was begun, explains the need and purpose of the book. The author's preface explains the terms such as "Amish," "Amish Mennonite," "Old Order Amish," and others which are frequently used in the book. In addition the preface describes the geographic location of the Amish, which is also made clear by an excellent two-page map of Old Order Amish Mennonite communities in the United States. In his foreword the author describes the places in which he found his material as well as the outline he uses in presenting it.

Part A, 39 pages, lists published books and pamphlets. Arranged alphabetically according to author, each book is described briefly, its publisher and year of publication are given, and the number of pages it contains is stated. Over 220 books and pamphlets are presented in this section.

In Part B unpublished graduate theses dealing with the Amish are listed on five pages. Although an extensive search to discover these theses was conducted, it is perhaps in this area where the bibliography is most seriously incomplete. Because thesis titles on the Amish do not always reveal their contents and because such studies sometimes fall outside the common fields of history, sociology, and education, certain ones may have been overlooked as was done, for example, in not listing Joan Kalhorn's thesis on "Ideological Differences Among Rural Children," written in the Department of Child Welfare, University of Iowa, in 1941.

Part C on published articles runs through 29 pages, listing on an average seven articles per page. Here one is struck with the large variety of periodicals which have carried Amish articles. Not only in the Mennonite papers and in the historical magazines but also in journals of educational psychology, journals of music and folklore, farm papers, and in large city dailies have these articles appeared. Again it is not claimed that this list is exhaustive.

Unpublished sources are given in Part D. This is followed by an analytical subject index. Finally the author presents the addresses of periodicals, newspapers, and other sources cited.

A bibliography such as this could not have been prepared except by long and tedious labor. To know where to search for these articles,

pamphlets, and unpublished materials required not only a knowledge of the Amish people but also an understanding of the numerous references and indexes now available in college and university libraries. As important as the finding of the article is the keen evaluation of its worth which the author presents for each item listed. Students of Mennonite and Amish life and history will for many years to come be indebted to John A. Hostetler for his *Bibliography on the Amish.*

Mennonite Research Foundation Melvin Gingerich

Mennonite Cyclopedic Dictionary. A Compendium of the Doctrines, History, Activities, Literature, and Environments of the Mennonite Church, Especially in America. Daniel Kauffman, Editor, assisted by many brethren. Scottdale, Pa.: The Mennonite Publishing House, 1937. Pp. XI, 443. $2.00.

Daniel Kauffman (1865-1944), though not trained in the schools, was an astonishingly prolific writer and editor, the most prolific probably in the history of American Mennonitism. He was also a historian after a fashion, having collaborated with J. S. Hartzler in 1905 in the production of the first English Mennonite history (*Mennonite Church History,* Scottdale, 1905) and written a brief Mennonite history for the use of short-term Bible Schools, as well as several semi historical monographs. His *Mennonite Cyclopedic Dictionary* is the high point of his historical production, truly a remarkable volume when one considers his deficiency in historical training and his scanty use of scholarly sources. It is largely his own, both in compilation and actual writing of articles, although a number of articles were written by others, particularly John Horsch (it is regrettable that such articles were not signed by their proper authors), and bears the marks of his personality and style on every page.

To properly evaluate this work, one should remember the self-imposed limitations of the author: (1) brevity (most articles have less than 100 words; it is a dictionary more than an encyclopedia); (2) only subjects relating to or of interest to his own branch, "The Mennonite Church," are treated, thus omitting much of real interest and value; (3) popular style (it is definitely not scholarly, thorough, nor critical, nor is it usually precise, many approximations of dates, geography, etc., being given; (4) doctrinal topics are included, always from the simple, unlearned, conservative point of view of the author. Remembering these limitations, it can be said that the author has fairly attained his goal and produced a generally useful work which can be recommended for home use and general enlightenment, and has found a considerable market.

The *Mennonite Cyclopedia Dictionary* is, however, by no means a substitute for even a one-volume historical encyclopedia of Mennonitism nor a theological dictionary for Mennonites. Besides lacking very many articles which would properly belong in such a volume, the articles are too sketchy, and often irritatingly general, and there are too many inaccuracies and errors in details, for instance, of dates and names. Some of the articles are trivial, such as "vice" at 50 words, "virtue" at 60 words, "visions" at 125 words, to mention but a few. The evaluation of individuals in the biographies is kind and appreciative, but practically standardized and, therefore, generally meaningless. The relative size of articles is often out of proportion, e.g., Vineland, a small congregation of 77 members, receives 17 lines, while the Virginia Conference receives only 26 lines, M.S. Steiner receives 46 lines, while the Stahly family receives 50 lines although

it has not produced a single outstanding leader in America. Carelessness in editing has not been entirely eliminated. For instance, the first line of the preface calls the book *Mennonite Encyclopedic Dictionary.*

However, even for the historian, the book has considerable value. It contains over 250 brief Mennonite family histories, and "between 500 and 1,000 biographies" of Mennonite leaders, and several hundred congregational sketches, with much information to be found nowhere else.

Goshen College Harold S. Bender

A Brief History of the Mennonites in Ontario Giving a Description of Conditions in Early Ontario—the Coming of the Mennonites into Canada—Settlements—Congregations—Conferences—Other Activities—and Nearly 400 Ordinations. 100 Pictures of Men and Churches, Illustrations and Maps. Written and compiled under the direction of the Mennonite Conference of Ontario. By L. J. Burkholder [1875-1950], Markham, Ontario. [Published by the author.] 1935. Pp. 358. $2.50.

The heart of this regional history of the Mennonites of Ontario is the carefully prepared and detailed history of each of the congregations (both living and extinct) of the Ontario Mennonite Conference, pp. 43-129, and of the Alberta-Saskatchewan Conference, a daughter of the Ontario Conference, pp. 130-137. Dates and names of the first settlers are followed by lists of ministers, history of the meetinghouse and worship, activities and organizations, schisms, and items of special interest. A similar account of the Amish Mennonites of Ontario, pp. 218-243, is contributed by Amish minister Jacob R. Bender (1875-1947). Another major section is the exhaustive list of all ordained men of the Ontario Mennonite Conference from the beginning, with thumbnail biographical sketches, pp. 277-314.

A brief account of the immigration to Ontario (1786-1830) by settlements precedes the congregational histories and presents much data not otherwise attainable. The author estimates that the immigrant groups may have totaled 1,000 souls and doubts that the 1828 government report of 1,164 members and 2,388 hearers is accurate. He staunchly upholds the theory that the Mennonites came to Ontario primarily for political reasons, that is, because they were opposed to the Revolution and preferred to remain loyal to the British crown to which they had given their promise of allegiance. He concedes that the economic motive was also present, but secondary. This reviewer holds that altogether some of the very earliest immigrants may have come for this reason, yet it is highly doubtful that the majority did so, since they came chiefly in the 1800-1830 period, i.e., twenty to fifty years after the war was over. The United Empire Loyalists (Tories) largely completed their migration to Canada before the bulk of the Mennonites arrived.

There is much valuable material in the chapters on the Mennonite Conference of Ontario (VI, 138151), the History of Activities (VII, 152-172), Divisive Movements (IX, 179-217), and Mennonites and Military Service (XIII, 258-272). The briefer chapters on the Russian Migrations, The Reformed Mennonites, Related Bodies, and the Nonresistant Relief Organization are welcome, as are also the appendices containing various official constitutions.

All in all this is a most useful book, a credit to the devoted untrained historian who spent years in its preparation. That it does not enter into some of the deeper aspects of the theology and piety of the Mennonites of

Ontario, or the subtler changes which took place in this group during the almost 150 years covered by the book, though disappointing, is perhaps not surprising. It is the common weakness of amateur historians. For Ontario as well as other parts of the Mennonite Church in America, this interpretation and evaluation remains to be done, and such books as L. J. Burkholder's will be valuable assets in the task.

One of the unusual but very valuable and attractive features of the book is the truly extraordinary collection of photographs of older ordained men (over 50), and church buildings (about 60). The five maps are also useful.

Goshen College Harold S. Bender

Mennonites in the World War or Nonresistance Under Test. By J. S. Hartzler assisted by a committee appointed by Mennonite General Conference. Scottdale, Pa.: The Mennonite Publishing House, 1921. Pp. 246. $1.25.

When the United States was drawn into the first World War the Mennonite General Conference appointed a special committee to look after the interests of members of the church who were subject to conscription, and to represent their cause before the government. J. S. Hartzler was not a member of this committee, but he served for a time as secretary for the committee, conducting its correspondence, keeping its records, and at times visiting Mennonite conscientious objectors in the army camps. Following the close of the war he drew upon this experience, and upon the records in his care, to write the story of the Mennonite war experience.

The first two chapters give a few glimpses of early Mennonite history and the experience of the Mennonites in previous wars. Chapter III speaks of the World War. Chapters IV and V describe the manner in which the Mennonite Church met the issue of war in 1917. Chapters VI to X tell the story of conscription, registration, questionnaires, the call to camp, and the experiences of men in camp. Chapter XIII describes the camp visitation program of the committee appointed by General Conference.

Unlike the conscientious objector of the second World War who was called to a C.P.S. camp, his predecessor in the first World War was sent to an army camp where he had to take his stand as a C.O. in a hostile environment. The war department's orders were that sincere C.O.'s unable to accept army service, either combatant or noncombatant, should be segregated until such time as proper disposition of their cases could be made. In some cases these orders were carried out fairly well, but in others uninformed and unsympathetic camp officials were responsible for a notorious mismanagement and mistreatment of the C.O.'s. Chapter X quotes numerous documents giving detailed descriptions of these experiences including mock trials, confinement in the guard house, courts-martial, etc. Chapter XI describes life in the disciplinary barracks to which court-martialed men were sentenced. Chapter XII tells the story of the public relations of the Mennonites in their home counties. Chapter XIV is a brief account of Mennonite relief work following the first World War. The two concluding chapters evaluate the wartime experience of the church, and the postwar problems with which she was concerned.

Mennonites in the World War is not a scholarly work based on extended research. It is rather an eye-witness account by a church leader, who had access to a considerable amount of documentary material. Told

in simple language, sometimes a bit quaint, it served a very useful purpose in its time. After thirty years, however, the time has now arrived when the Mennonite experience in the first World War needs to be written afresh from the vantage point of greater historical perspective by a trained historian making use of more extended source materials than those which were available to the author in 1921.

Goshen College Guy F. Hershberger

Aufzeichnungen über Entstchung und Bekenntnis der Gemeinschaft Evangelisch Taufgesinnter. By Hermann Rüegger, senior. Zürich, 1948. Pp. 186.

This book presents the story of the *Gemeinschaft Evangelisch Taufgesinnter,* known officially in the United States as the Apostolic Christian Church. Its history is of special interest to Mennonites since its historical roots and spiritual heritage previous to 1830 are in part those of Swiss Anabaptism. (In 1832-35 Fröhlich won two preachers, Christian Gerber and Christian Baumgartner, and about sixty members of the Emmenthal congregation, to his cause, and established with sixty members from the state church there, his largest initial base congregation.) Its subsequent history reveals numerous contacts with Anabaptists in Switzerland and America, resulting in such cognomens as *Neu Taufer* in Switzerland, as well as in Ohio and Indiana, and "New Amish" in central Illinois and New York.

The author is Hermann Rüegger, senior, an 80-year-old elder in the *Gemeinschaft* living near Zürich, Switzerland. His long personal association with the church and his study of the writings of Samuel Heinrich Fröhlich, founder of the church, make him well qualified for the task he has undertaken.

The book opens with the traditional cursory review of the spiritual heritage of Anabaptism tracing the various non-Catholic movements from earliest Christianity to Reformation times. It is interesting to note the use of Samuel Geiser's *Die Taufgesinnten Gemeinden,* especially for this chapter, since in Switzerland the animosity between the *Neu Taufer* and *Alt Taufer. (Altevangelischen Taufgesinnten Gemeinden* [Mennonites]) is great and well known. For the author to surmount this ill feeling in this portion of the book as well as in several specific references to the *Alt Taufer* and Mennonites strikes a new note in their relationships.

The genesis of the *Gemeinschaft* is given in a much clearer light than either Müller or Geiser have done in their histories of Bernese Anabaptism. Rügger had as his main source for the first quarter century of the movement the writings, including diaries and many letters, of Samuel Heinrich Fröhlich. This vast amount of documentary meterial had previously been untapped for a study of this nature, although certain of the letters of Frölich had printed and widely distributed. Archival materials at Bern and Zürich also supplemented the author's use of the Frölich papers.

The high point in the story of the *Gemeinschaft Evangelisch Taufgesinnter,* which incidentally could also be a profound example to present-day missionary-minded Christian churches, is the narration of the spread of the Christian faith by Fröhlich and his followers during its first fifty years of existence. While other Anabaptist groups were busy arguing with each other over church rules, the *Neu Taufer* were busy spreading their faith, which was almost identical with that of the *Alt Taufer,* winning converts and starting *Gemeinschaften.* In a matter of three decades after

its inception active churches of this faith were to be found from one end of Switzerland to the other, in France, South Germany, and in areas now a part of the countries of Austria, Hungary, Yugoslavia, and Rumania, Through migration and missionary endeavors churches soon arose in the United States, their present stronghold, and later in South America.

Their missionary zeal, as well as the methods they used, remind one of early Anabaptist activities, yes, even of those early days of Christianity. A typical example is given on page 127:

"In the summer of 1839 two Hungarian locksmith apprentices, Johann Denkel and Johann Kropatschek, journeyed to Zürich. Here they heard Fröhlich preach, accepted his teachings and were baptized by him. Denkel spread his convictions to his fellow workers in Budapest, one of whom was Ludwig Henscey von Szent-Peter-Ur. He introduced them to the new teachings in November, 1839, and on May 8, 1840, they held their first worship service in the workshop of their employer. . . . In time Henscey and his brother wrote on paper their new confession of faith and the newly acquired members spread copies of it in Hungary, Bosnia, Slavonia, and Rumania where 226 churches now stand."

As good as the book may be there are certain shortcomings that should be noted. A completely unbiased account of the movement is not given nor should it be looked for in a study as this which was written by and intended only for the group it concerns. Several notable omissions occur, such as the complete lack of a bibliography or index. The addition of a few statistics of the *Gemeinschaft Evangelisch Taufgesinnter* would add greatly to the book. The paucity of space given to the churches in the Balkan countries as well as in the United States leaves a certain incompleteness. For example, no mention is made of the heroic stand made by the members in Yugoslavia who for the past seventy years have continually had to face ten year jail sentences for refusal to do military service, a few getting as many as three of these sentences. Neither is adequate mention made of the division that took place in their ranks in the United States, Germany, and Switzerland at the turn of the century, primarily over the wearing of the moustache. The story of the 5,000 members who now find themselves as refugees in Germany and Austria is also conspicuously absent.

For the person interested in Mennonite and Anabaptist history this book presents a valuable addition to his knowledge. This is the first writing on this topic to appear, and hence it makes a worth-while contribution in a hitherto unworked field.

Bluffton College Delbert L. Gratz

We Enter China. A statement of historical development, present progress, plans, ideals, and description of our Mennonite Mission in China. By J. D. Graber. Elkhart, Indiana: Mennonite Board of Missions and Charities, 1947. Pp. 48. 20 cents.

We Enter Japan. A statement of historical development, present progress, plans, ideals, and description of our Mennonite Mission in Japan. By J. D. Graber. Elkhart, Indiana: Mennonite Board Board of Missions and Charities, 1950. Pp. 46. 20 cents.

The foreign missions movement of the Mennonite churches of America is only a half century old. At the very beginning of the Anabaptist-Mennonite movement, in the sixteenth century, the members of this group

launched the first modern, evangelical missionary program. In only a few years of time, thousands of converts were won to their ranks, but fierce persecution almost annihilated the movement, and those who escaped were content to be let alone, having little zeal for the aggressive promotion of their beliefs. Finally near the end of the nineteenth century a new missionary spirit appeared in thir midst and several American Mennonite groups began missionary activity in India. In the years that followed, American Mennonites established missions in China, Africa, and Argentina, but during the years of the Great Depression and World War II, only a few new fields were entered. Since that time, however, there has been a new burst of Mennonite missionary activity, with most branches of the church entering new foreign fields. The (Old) Mennonite Church has in these years established missions in Ethiopia, Puerto Rico, Belgium, China, and Japan.

To stimulate interest in and an understanding of the last two named mission fields, the secretary of the Mennonite Board of Missions and Charities, J. D. Graber, has written two booklets presenting the "historical development, present progress, plans, ideals, and description" of these two missions. The booklets are part of two study kits, the "China Mission Study Kit" and the "Japan Mission Study Kit."

The booklet on China has five chapters on "China—An Open Door," "We Enter the Door," "The Task Before Us," "The plan of Advance," and "Local Color and Intimate Glimpses." The second chapter explains that by the spring of 1943 "the Board was ready to take some definite steps leading toward the opening of work in China," but it was not until September, 1947, that the first group of five missionaries from this branch of the Mennonite church sailed for that country.

In the nine chapters of *We Enter Japan,* Secretary Graber presents the argument for a Mennonite mission in that country, discusses postwar conditions in Japan, presents the problems of language study, gives the story of the arrival of the first Mennonite missionaries in Japan in December, 1949, clarifies the problem of locating a specific field within Japan, quotes from the diaries of the first Mennonite missionaries to that country, and pictures the land and people of Japan.

These booklets are records of contemporary history written by one who was a chief actor in the drama. From the historian's point of view, this kind of writing deserves to be praised, for it not only keeps the story straight for those who are now interested in the present developments of this program of missionary expansion but it also furnishes the kind of record necessary for the writing of a broader work, not yet attempted, on a half century of foreign missions in the (Old) Mennonite Church.

Mennonite Research Foundation. Melvin Gingerich.